DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 205 252 JC 810 500

AUTHOR	Parilla, Robert E.; And Others
TITLE	Focus on the Future Proceedings (Rockville, Maryland, February 22-23, 1980).
INSTITUTION	Montgomery Coll., Rockville, Md.
PUB DATE	[80]
NOTE	180p.
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC08 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Adult Students; *College Instruction; *Community Colleges; Demography; Disabilities; Economic Factors; *Educational Finance; Females; Financial Support; Foreign Students; *Futures (of Society); *Government School Relationship; Labor Needs; Minority Groups; Nontraditional Students; *Population Trends; Reentry Students; Regional Characteristics; Two Year Colleges; *Two Year College Students

ABSTRACT

Summaries are provided of the presentations made at Montgomery College's (MC's) two-day conference conducted to acquaint college trustees, staff, and students and the community with major issues likely to affect MC in the 1980's. First, six papers consider economic trends: "Implications of Economic Trends for Higher Education" by Susan Nelson; "Federal Support of Higher Education" by Charles Saunders; "The Maryland Financial Picture and Its Implications for Community College Finance" by Sheila Tolliver; "Economic Development Plans for Montgomery County" by Margaret Cudney; and "Transportation in Montgomery County in the 1980's" by John Clark and Kay Stevens. The next authors focus on changing social characteristics: Harold Hodgkinson looks at national demography, Drew Dedrick at Montgomery County, and David Armstrong at the MC student body. After Edward Gruson's and Lawrence Gladieux's papers on "The Role of Government in Higher Education," Kenneth Eble assesses the "Challenges Ahead" in teaching and learning; Jamison Gilder and Rexford Moon look at "The Adult Student in the 1980's," and Rufus Daniels explores "Manpower Needs in the 1980's." Finally, six authors discuss the role of the community college with regard to the following special population groups: the handicapped (Leslie Milk), returning women (Jeanne Fisher-Thompson), older Americans (Arthur Fleming), minority students (Lorenzo Morris and James Tschechtelin), and the international student (Valerie Woolston). (AYC)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

FOCUS ON THE FUTURE PROCEEDINGS

ED205252

JC 810 500

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Charlene Nunley

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

Montgomery College

February 22-23, 1980

PROCEEDINGS

FOCUS ON THE FUTURE CONFERENCE

February 22-23, 1980

MONTGOMERY COLLEGE

Montgomery County, Maryland

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

Introduction 1

Opening Remarks, Dr. Robert E. Parilla 3

Economic Trends

Implications of Economic Trends for Higher Education

Susan Nelson 11

Federal Support of Higher Education

Charles Saunders 21

The Maryland Financial Picture and its Implications for Community College Finance

Sheila Tolliver. 29

Economic Development Plans for Montgomery County

Margaret Cudney. 39

Transportation in Montgomery County in the 1980's

John Clark 47

Kay Stevens. 49

Social Characteristics

Social Characteristics of the Population in the 1980's

Harold L. Hodgkinson 55

Social Characteristics of the Montgomery County Population in the 1980's

Drew Dedrick 75

Social Characteristics of the Montgomery College Student Body in the 1980's

David Armstrong. 81

Governmental Factors

The Role of Government in Higher Education

Edward Gruson. 89

Lawrence Gladieux. 109

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

Teaching and Learning

The Challenge Ahead

Kenneth Eble. 119

The Adult Student in the 1980's

Jamison Gilder. 131

Rexford Moon. 137

Manpower Needs in the 1980's

Rufus Daniels 145

Special Student Populations

The Role of the Community College in Meeting the Educational Needs of Handicapped People

Leslie Milk 153

The Role of the Community College in Meeting the Educational Needs of Returning Women

Jeanne Fisher-Thompson. 161

The Role of the Community College in Meeting the Educational Needs of Older Americans

Arthur S. Flemming. 169

Minority Students in Higher Education

Lorenzo Morris. 175

Community Colleges and the Minority Student: Past Progress and Future Directions

James Tschechtelin. 183

The International Student: Enrollment Trends and Educational Needs

Valerie Woolston. 187

INTRODUCTION

This publication is a summary of presentations made at Montgomery College's Focus on the Future Workshop on February 22 and 23, 1980. In a few cases, technical problems with recording equipment have made transcriptions of a presentation impossible. The great majority of the presentations have been transcribed, however, and reviewed by the presenter prior to inclusion in this document.

The Focus on the Future Conference was a two-day conference to help College trustees, staff, students, and the community examine major issues likely to affect Montgomery College in the 1980's and to assist the Board of Trustees in setting goals for Montgomery College to meet community needs in a changing society.

Members of the Conference Planning Committee are listed below.

Charlene Nunley
Director of Planning and Management
Chairman

James D. Darr
College Coordinator of Admissions and Records

George Davis, Jr.
Director of Finance

Howard S. Geer
Dean of Community Services

Thomas D. Kirkland
Director of Public Information

LaVerne W. Miller
Director of Learning Resources
Takoma Park Campus

W. Thomas Renwick
Campus Facilities Manager
Germantown Campus

Harold P.G.H. Thomas
Lecturer in Economics
Germantown Campus

Wilfred Saint, Jr.
Dean of Social Sciences Institute
Takoma Park Campus

Kenneth D. Wantling
Associate Professor of Mathematics
Rockville Campus

Opening Remarks: Dr. Robert E. Parilla, President, Montgomery College

The purpose of this workshop is to involve the Board, the faculty, the staff, the administrators, the students, as well as community representatives, in attempting to forecast factors that will affect the future of this institution. Our second purpose is to review the forecasts of national, state and local experts who are on the panels and who will make presentations during the next day and a half. We want to review their opinions and their forecasts with respect to social, educational, economic and governmental trends that will affect the College. Thirdly, we intend to develop formal lists--and this is where most of you will play a very significant role--of forecast and implications that will be reviewed by our Board of Trustees as a basis for developing broad general educational goals for the institution. And, fourthly, our purpose is to initiate a planning process that will permit Montgomery College, to the greatest extent possible, to influence its future and not simply react to factors as they develop.

I think that we in the institution have felt somewhat proud of our efforts. I know the committee has, in that we had just about completed the program when the Carnegie Council on Policy Studies, a national body, released excerpts of its newest report called "Three Thousand Futures: the Next Twenty Years for Higher Education." In that report, the Carnegie Council made many recommendations, but three that appeared up front in their document made us feel somewhat prophetic in that (1) they recommended very strongly that institutions analyze all factors likely to affect future enrollments, (2) they recommended that institutions insist on planning processes, and (3) they indicated that institutions must strive for the most effective use of resources. The Council said in another part of the recommendations that all constituencies of higher education, from students through federal officials, must address aggressively the problems that higher education will face in the next two decades if the system is to survive in relatively good form. I think that we must understand, however, that development of planning processes will not make our decisions easy. Planning processes will assist us as professionals, and as community representatives to identify the issues with which we must grapple. They will not necessarily help us make the decisions that must be made in the next several years any more easily.

I think it is important to note that the committee was not able to identify any other institution that has at this point been involved, as we are, in attempting as an institution to bring people to us so that we can in fact review what so-called national experts, state experts and local experts are saying, so that we as a body can review that kind of information and make some recommendations. So frequently institutions will send a few people to national conferences but in fact it's only a few and those few frequently are not vocal enough or maybe not great enough in number to have the institution understand that which they heard. Our purpose here is to expose the greatest number of institutional people to these experts and have us evaluate them internally. I know of no other institution currently that is attempting this.

The purpose, in addition to developing the forecasting, is to help the institution define and develop its planning and evaluation cycle. It's important for me to say to all of those here that if the planning process becomes an objective in itself, we have failed. What must happen is that we use the planning process to the best of our ability to help us carry out those things that are most important in an educational institution and that is what happens in the classroom setting. We believe that planning is an annual and a long-range process; that planning is involved initially with forecasting.

Opening Remarks

Any organization or individual that wishes to plan must forecast and from there develop goals and objectives, and then allocate resources. Once we've matched what it is we want to do with the resources we have available, we must implement the program. The administration is not complete unless we understand how well, in fact, we have achieved the goals and objectives that we set for ourselves. And, based on that evaluation, we begin the process of planning again. It is important for us to understand that no one group does all the planning, that no one individual is responsible for all of the planning, and that a planning process in a complex organization such as Montgomery College must take place in a coordinated and integrated way to the best extent possible, understanding that everyone has responsibility. You'll note that we're talking about moving from very general to more specific in the planning process. We're talking about moving from forecasting, which is the initiation of the planning process, through to the evaluation of results.

The Futures Workshop today deals only with the forecasting function. Again, what we are attempting to do is to look very carefully, and in the greatest detail possible, at the forecasts that we believe will affect the future of Montgomery College. Based on that forecast and based on our understanding of what the institution's mission is, our Board of Trustees will deal with establishing, or reaffirming, institution-wide goals so that we can move on in terms of describing objectives, allocating resources, and developing the activities to implement the program. Eventually each campus will be involved in seeing how well its forecasts support the forecasts of the College-wide effort that we're involved in today and in determining that the campus mission, in fact, supports the College-wide mission. Individual operating units, or budget units, or instructional units must also be involved in determining which forecasts of the future affect that individual unit and in understanding how the unit relates to the rest of the institution. Planning may appear to be complex, but it does not have to be complex. And, again, I must say we're not interested in developing a planning process specifically for the purpose of having planning. We're interested in developing a planning process so that we can assist the institution in its principal mission.

I have outlined the basics of a planning process to indicate to you that what we are about today is to kick off this entire process with a system of forecasting. The procedures we'll follow I think you are aware of. We will have general sessions with speakers who will discuss areas of their expertise. Based on the various presentations that you will hear in the next couple of days, we have assigned all of those who are part of the College's governance system to small groups of 10 to 15 people. Those groups will do some critical thinking about what they've heard, what they know about this institution, etc., and will attempt to develop forecast statements and implications with respect to educational issues, economic issues, social issues, and governmental issues. We hope that you will participate especially in those sessions that would have the most to say about the areas in which we will be asking you to make some forecast statements. The expectations that we have in general are that you would gain an understanding of those topical areas to which you have been assigned--that you should concentrate especially on those presentations. Obviously, following the presentations you should feel free to ask questions of the speakers.

Our expectations of the participants, or what we are asking of you as participants, is to absorb and intellectually deal with that which you hear over the next two days. We're asking you, through your groups, to make statements of forecast and implication about the institution. A forecast statement, very generally, defined for you is a prediction of future events that will affect Montgomery College. And, we're asking you also to make statements of implication, a statement that considers what may happen to the institution if we take no action with respect to the forecast, and secondly, identify action that may be taken that would affect the forecast or our ability to deal with the forecast that you have made. I hope you'll be as creative as you can be. I hope that you will critically evaluate what you hear in light of your experience with the institution. I hope you will use your knowledge about this institution and apply it to what you hear. I hope you will participate actively in the discussion, and I hope you will think in broad terms. You will recall that we're talking about the forecasting effort on the College-wide basis. Therefore, it is important that you think in broad terms with respect to the future of the institution. I hope that you would recognize that the product of your work--the forecast statements--will be received by the Board in the closing session. That information will be used by the Board to set the broad institutional goals. I hope you accept and recognize that the sessions are an advisory process to the Board of Trustees.

Some things I should add in the way of don'ts. I hope that no one would monopolize the time in discussion sessions. I hope that everyone would have the opportunity to be heard. I hope that you would not focus only on one issue for the entire small group period. I hope that you would be able to discuss an issue, come to resolve, and to finalize it, and I hope that you would understand that this is our first effort of this nature. There may be in fact some rough spots but I'm sure that with your work and with your understanding, this will be an extremely successful program. I think that the outcome--one of the primary outcomes that we can expect--will be to increase understanding of the future and the ways in which the future may affect this institution. A second outcome will be an increased understanding by the institution that we can affect the future and not simply react to it.

Opening Remarks

I sincerely appreciate your giving up your time to be with us. I sincerely appreciate your interest in the institution which is displayed by your willingness to be here. I'm excited about this first step in a planning process. I think that Montgomery College has a history and tradition of excellence and I'm sure that this will help us maintain that record.

13

ECONOMIC TRENDS

IMPLICATIONS OF ECONOMIC TRENDS FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

Susan Nelson, Research Associate
Brookings Institution

As the 1980's begin, it is important for community colleges to look at themselves and the economy and the world around them in planning their future.

The topic of economic trends for higher education is quite large, so I will be able to talk only about some of the factors that I think are most important in the national scene. In preparing these comments on the implications of economic trends for higher education and for the future of public finance for community colleges, I have benefited greatly from discussions with other staff members at the Brookings Institution who specialize in macro-economics. In addition I have drawn on studies that I and my colleague David Brenneman have been doing for the last several years on higher education finance and on community colleges in particular.

I intend to divide the topic, "Implications of Economic Trends for Higher Education and the Future of Public Finance for Community Colleges," into three questions and address them in turn. First, what are the major trends in the economy that will be affecting higher education in the next five or ten years? Second, what are their implications for higher education in general? And third, what can be said in particular about public finance for community colleges?

Looking into the future, I do not want to try to predict what will happen but simply draw out the implications of where current forces might lead if unforeseen events do not occur. But, of course, unforeseen events will intervene and will change the future from what today we think it will be. To state my general conclusions first though: my view of the economy is fairly pessimistic. Our problems are serious and no solutions are in sight. Higher education in general is entering very difficult times. Whether the future for community colleges will be brighter than for the other sectors of higher education depends less, I think, on economic factors than on what the colleges themselves do.

With that caveat in mind, I turn to the first question of major economic trends. I think there are four major economic factors that should be examined in this context--inflation, energy, declining productivity, and demographics. The first three represent the major problems confronting the economy as a whole but they have additional implications for higher education. Demographic effects on school and college enrollments are well known but the changing age composition of the population has other implications for the economy and for higher education.

According to most economists, inflation will continue to be an excruciating fact of life well into the 1980's. While I know of no forecast that predicts it will stay as high as the current level of 13 percent for long, there are also few rational forecasts that see inflation falling below even 6 percent in the near future. While the debate on the causes of this inflation continues and tends to follow ideological lines, there is a fair consensus, at least among my colleagues at Brookings, that the fundamental problems lie in the supply side of the economy rather than on the demand side.

Unlike the situation that developed in the late 1960's when excess demand from the spending on the Vietnam War started prices rising, inflation is now being fueled by forces pushing up the cost, such as world food markets, energy prices, other raw materials, with interest rates joining the list of special factors this past year. In 1979, energy was the largest single factor pushing up the consumer price index, contributing over three of the total 13 point increase.

A less obvious but no less important contributor to inflation has been the declining productivity of recent years. Productivity or real output per hour worked in the economy is the magical force that can allow workers' wages to increase without contributing to inflation. If a worker can produce more, the employer can pay him more without having to raise his prices. Rise in productivity also facilitates real growth and gross national product. Until the late 1960's, productivity was growing by about 2.4 percent per year. Since then it has been falling, averaging only about one percent per year in the late 1970's. Last year, 1979, it was actually negative. While the cause of this declining productivity is not fully understood, it clearly has the effect of pushing up the cost of production and the rate of inflation.

Unfortunately, economists have so far been unable to come up with an acceptable solution for solving inflation pushed by rising costs. The traditional remedy for inflation, tight fiscal and monetary policy, works by reducing demand in the economy but not necessarily cost. It has been estimated that this method can reduce inflation by one point only by increasing unemployment by one point also, a trade-off which most policymakers consider unacceptable. Wage and price controls, another alternative frequently suggested, as part of a comprehensive package for dealing with inflation, offer no more than hope of solving inflation, while they promise to produce substantial costs in misallocation of resources and in bureaucracy. Some of my colleagues at Brookings have come to the agonizing conclusion in recent months that this may be the lesser of the various evils, but this is by no means the consensus view. Until the declining productivity is better understood, that too cannot be easily reversed. Some other less traditional strategies have been suggested for solving the problem of inflation, but politically they hold no hope. So, unfortunately, inflation and low economic growth seem to be here to stay for awhile.

What in particular does persisting inflation mean for higher education? First it means that the costs of producing higher education will keep rising as they have in the 1970's. During the 70's the cost of goods and services on which colleges have spent their money rose at about the same rate as the general rate of inflation in the economy, but higher education's keeping pace with inflation was possible only because the real wages of faculty members fell, for reasons I will discuss later. For higher education to keep pace with inflation, and perhaps allow the faculty salaries to also keep up, tuition and state and local appropriations will also have to keep growing or ways must be found to reduce costs. If tax rates are not changed, inflation should keep state and local budgets approximately rising with the rate of inflation, but cost of other public services will also keep going up. It is possible that inflation might automatically generate some surplus in the state and local budgets as it has in the last few years, but the prospects are dim. Reducing real cost of education per student requires changes in the way education is provided. Since higher education is a service industry with most of the cost going to faculty salaries, there is little natural growth in productivity as there is supposed to be in the economy at large. Increasing student-faculty ratios, relying more on part-time faculty or cutting back on other services provided are some of the possible ways that costs might be cut, but none of these options is pleasant.

The problems of energy and low productivity have consequences for the economy as a whole and for higher education, even apart from their contributions to inflation. Since the oil boycott of 1973, the cost of energy has increased nearly five-fold and will continue increasing further, even without more help from OPEC, until domestic prices are fully decontrolled and brought in line with world prices by the fall of 1981. This radical change in price of energy relative to other goods and services is having a fundamental effect on the way we all live and on the way industry functions. There are many losers in this adjustment process but there are some winners, such as the manufacturers of insulation, of sweaters, and of small cars. This fundamental change in prices seems to present a challenge and opportunity for higher education to contribute innovations and new ideas that will ease the adjustment to scarce and expensive energy for individuals and business alike. This is an adjustment process that the economy cannot avoid.

For higher education as a consumer of energy, the soaring prices have had no more effect on educational costs than they have had on cost in the economy as a whole, simply because salaries account for so much of educational budgets. Of course, this is less true in some regions than others. New England has been harder hit than California. At the same time, higher gas prices probably have and will continue to affect enrollment decisions--to encourage students to choose a residential college instead of a community college or to encourage others not to attend at all if it means a long drive. As I'm sure you all are aware, a student driving a gas guzzler could spend as much on commuting as on tuition at a community college. Community colleges located in urban areas of high residential density would have their enrollment less affected than rural campuses.

The decline in productivity also has serious implications for the economy as a whole and for higher education. When productivity is not growing and real output is not rising, it means the economic pie is also not getting any larger. For one segment of society to get a larger piece of the pie, another segment must get less. In the good old days of the 1960's when there was substantial real growth in the economy, real wages could increase at the same time. Profits rose without price increases. After a decade of stagflation, every sector of the economy thinks that it needs and that it also deserves more of the economic pie than it is getting. While the public sector would like to provide more and better services to the public, the taxpayer wants to increase his real standard of living. If his standard of living is barely keeping up with inflation as will be the best that can be expected if stagflation does continue, one way for him to try to increase his real disposable income is to cut his taxes. As long as productivity and growth in the economy stays sluggish, I think that the so-called taxpayer's revolt will continue and it will continue to inhibit increase in what the public sector, including education, can do.

This has two important implications. For the public sector to maintain its claim on taxpayers' earnings, much less to increase that claim, it will no longer be sufficient to argue that additional dollars spent on higher education, for example, will be put to good use. It will be necessary to convince the taxpayer that he will be better off if the college spends that dollar than if the taxpayer does. Second, difficult times facing the economy present another challenge that I think community colleges are especially well situated to undertake, that is to take an active role in helping the local economy, both business and workers, to start generating real growth again. This is not a new mission for community colleges but I think it will require new approaches and perhaps more imagination than in the past.

In addition to inflation, energy, and productivity, the changing age composition of the population will continue affecting the economy and education in the decade ahead. Look at just three of those effects. The first is the well known decline in the traditional college-age population. The high school graduating class of 1979 is the largest in the foreseeable future. Between 1979 and 1991, the next 12 years, the number of high school graduates is expected to drop by 26 percent nationally and in Maryland by 34 percent. These facts cause much more fear and trembling at university campuses than they do at community colleges where so much of the student body is not just fresh out of high school. I would argue, though, that community colleges should not just sit back complacently and wait for their older non-traditional students to continue filling the places vacated by recent high school graduates. The rest of higher education, public and private alike, has already started increasing its attention on those non-traditional populations and can be expected to become more flexible in scheduling and in giving credit for experiences outside of college. Competition for the fewer 18 year olds also will intensify. Federal and state student aid programs have already put a four-year college within the financial reach of many who a decade ago could only afford a community college. Moreover, as the squeeze worsens, four-year colleges across the country can be expected to ease their entrance standards, from the elite institutions down to the most open door state colleges. The competition for 18 year olds will not be confined to other colleges and universities. The military and labor market also will be making more attractive offers to recent high school graduates. Indeed, as the labor market for youth starts to improve in the next few years, it is quite possible that the college-going rate, the fraction of high school graduates who go right on to higher education, will fall. Community colleges are undoubtedly in a better position with drop in the traditional college-age population than is the rest of higher education, but that position is still difficult.

The second effect that demographic changes will have on higher education falls primarily on faculty; that is, the academic job market will remain depressed. In the 1950's and 1960's when higher education was booming, Ph.D's were in short supply and there were many teaching positions open. Consequently, faculty salaries rose faster than wages generally in the economy, and tenure was granted to many young professors. Now that enrollment growth has slowed, not many colleges are expending their faculties while few professors are retiring, resulting in few openings for new Ph.D's. Not surprisingly, as the excess supply of Ph.D's developed in the last decade, graduate enrollments fell but not enough to keep faculty salaries from lagging behind inflation. The problem of tenure will intensify through the 1980's, giving little hope that economic forces alone will let faculty salaries even keep up with inflation.

The picture for community college faculties is not this bleak because professors there are less apt to have Ph.D's, are more apt to be part time, and in the occupational technical areas have other non-academic employment opportunities. Nevertheless, the excess supply of instructors for four-year colleges will inevitably spill over as it probably already has to the market for two-year faculty. In addition, the community college market will also be swelled by former secondary school teachers whose chances for advancement in high schools have been dimmed by falling enrollments there.

A third effect that demographic changes will have in the future relates to public sector budgets. State and local governments have historically had primary responsibility for public education, while the federal government has more responsibility for the elderly. As the population ages through the rest of the century, current programs alone will require an increasing share of the federal budget. Already, more than one-third of every dollar spent by the federal government--37¢--actually goes for the elderly. The aging of the population, combined with the strong trend toward early retirements and toward longer lives, will make this segment of the population an increasingly powerful political force. It will be extremely difficult to reduce their benefits. The falling elementary-secondary school enrollments should allow a smaller fraction of state and local budgets to be spent on education and still maintain a constant quality, but the savings possible here would be much less than proportionate to the drop in enrollment.

Implications of Economic Trends for Higher Education

What does all this discussion of inflation, energy, productivity, and demographics imply about the prospects for public finance for community colleges? First, I think that it suggests that the future is uncertain and will be difficult, but it need not be bleak. Political factors will probably be more important than economic factors in determining the financing for community colleges. Among economic forces that will be at work, I think the aging of the population fully suggests that the federal government will not be the place to turn for higher support. Washington will have its hands full and its coffers depleted taking care of the elderly. At the state and local levels, even with stagflation, tax revenues could keep pace with inflation. With declining elementary-secondary school enrollments and the climbing real cost there, state and local officials and voters will be able to choose whether to cut taxes or to spend the savings on other public services such as higher education and community colleges. The choice will depend to a large extent on the case that can be made for keeping those funds in the public sector rather than returning them to the taxpayer's pocket. The taxpayer is bound to be more generous with the public sector if growth has returned to the economy and if his standard of living is rising and if he has adapted to using less energy.

I close with a few suggestions for making the outlook brighter for public support of community colleges. One of the most effective arguments for increased subsidy is a strong and high quality program. A more active involvement in the local economy could have economic as well as political benefits.

Second, I think it's important to distinguish between something that merits doing and something that merits subsidy. In virtually every state that we've visited in the course of our study of community college finance, we have encountered at least one very expensive course such as poodle grooming, cake decorating, or jeep driving on military bases--expensive because they ended up costing community colleges a lot in terms of goodwill and credibility.

In light of the increase in competition for college students, both traditional age, and non-traditional students, and in view of a slowly growing economy, I think that increased coordination with the other sectors of higher education would be advisable. A united front for higher education might be more persuasive in Annapolis than each sector speaking for its own self-interest.

It is important that state finance formulas for community colleges accurately reflect the political will of the state. If the state does not want to pay for additional enrollments, the finance formulas that distribute funds to individual institutions should not ostensibly provide incentives for enrolling more students and penalties for keeping enrollments constant or declining. Similarly, if the state wants community colleges to offer more high cost occupational technical courses and fewer general education courses, the formula should compensate the colleges for the higher average cost for occupational enrollments than for academic enrollments.

Finally, I think it is important to plan realistically for the future and to work together as a college community. This conference is a good example of such an effort. By identifying the problems and the prospects, you are taking the future into your own hands.

FEDERAL SUPPORT OF HIGHER EDUCATION

Charles Saunders, Vice President for Governmental Relations,
American Council on Education

Since my job is lobbying the Federal Government for more funding for higher education programs, I suspect that I was asked to be on this program in order to bring some good news about how much more federal assistance is going to be available. But I'm afraid I can't be altogether optimistic, even though I don't think the outlook is altogether pessimistic by any means. I would have to say by way of apology that this is a very poor time for prognostication. It is really too early to tell what the Congressional reaction is going to be to the budget that President Carter submitted in January. It is a hold-the-line budget for education, for higher education certainly, and there are some pessimists on the Hill, among them many friends of education who believe the outlook to be gloomy. With the state of economy and the state of constant international crisis, it is very likely that the needs of education may get pushed pretty far into the background and that things look bleak in this sector. I don't share that view. It seems to me that the President has at least asked for maintaining stability in current programs for higher education and has asked for some improvements in some selected areas. Congress on its past record has certainly always exceeded the requests of the administrations, the last three administrations that I'm familiar with. As a rule of thumb, Congress can be guaranteed every year to fund education programs from a half billion to a billion dollars more than the administration requests in its budget, so I think we have that kind of experience to go on. I don't think that anybody in the Congress is looking toward wholesale cuts in education programs at this time, and in fact, there are some signs that the very factors of the economy and international crisis that have been mentioned may provide very good reasons for strengthening a number of education programs that the Federal Government supports.

I think as far as the timing of my remarks goes, it is also important to note that it is a little early to predict the outcome of the current re-authorization process which is going on. The House last September passed by an overwhelming margin a very major re-authorization bill extending for five years all the higher education programs. Much of that bill contains very good news for the community colleges. The question is how much of that good news is going to be preserved in the Senate version and then in the version that finally comes out of the conference committee. As I say, it is too early to predict that. The Senate sub-committee will meet to mark up the bill next week. Our indications of what the Senate is likely to do are still very preliminary. At the same time, I think there are some trend lines apparent and they're encouraging trend lines. I think that no matter what the Senate may do, it's clear that one way or another there are going to be some further substantial expansions of existing student aid programs--for the grant programs particularly, increases in the basic grant maximum, changes in the need analysis criteria which will provide substantially increased benefits for low income students and improve commuter allowances and other features of the very complicated student aid packages which will be particularly helpful for students at community colleges. There is also some encouragement built into the House bill providing assistance for less than half-time students, a new departure and obviously of particular interest for community colleges.

I think there is always a certain amount of skepticism. As a matter of fact, the House bill was criticized by some for being so large and offering so many goodies for higher education. There are some skeptics who say this will really never be fully funded and it's all a mirage. I think that's untoward skepticism because the one central fact of the student aid programs as it has been modified in Congress over the last few years is that as they have been gradually expanded, eligibility has been opened. In the first few years of the basic grant program, for example, there were very few students with family incomes over $10,000 or $11,000 a year who were eligible for basic grants. Grant eligibility now has been extended up into the middle income range of $25,000-year families. In other words, that program has established a very strong political base and members of Congress are now very much aware that their vote on that program has an enormous impact in their own districts, so I don't see Congress taking the authorized expansion of the basic grant program lightly. I think the big action over the next decade is clearly going to be an improved assistance for students to go to institutions of higher education. I think that is the big thrust and it's notable here because it is a five-year extension that both the House and Senate are considering. This will set the pattern for at least half of the decade ahead and I think we can make some pretty firm predictions on that ground that the big increase is likely to be in student aid. Of the education department's $15 billion budget, for example, one-third of all that goes for student assistance, and I think that the dollars in student aid will inevitably be increasing as a result of the re-authorization legislation passed this year. It's also clear from the President's budget that there will be increasing emphasis on basic research. Of course, this has some very immediate implications for the major research universities, less so for the community colleges, but there may be some spinoffs to that new national concern that's clearly been identified to rebuild the nation's research capacity. There may be some very interesting implications for community colleges.

Beyond student aid, things get much less certain in the re-authorization picture. There is a move to build new support for programs supporting non-traditional students. It's not clear yet how this is going to come out of the Congressional mill. Even though the legislation will undoubtedly make new assistance in theory available to community colleges, there will be strong competition from the four-year institutions. But, the whole area of aid to non-traditional students and the concept of lifelong learning is one which Congress has given really only lip service to over the last few years. There was major authorizing legislation to establish a lifelong learning program last time around--three years ago when Congress renewed the higher education authorizations--but that has never been funded. The effort this year will be to try to build a stronger program which will attract funding and broad support from the higher education community; whether it succeeds is less certain.

A number of other possibilities or factors need to be weighed in looking at the federal picture over the next decade. For example, just how will the newly established department of education develop and what will be its early history? Officially, it won't be established until the spring, and it's not clear to what extent the new department will be an advocate for education. Will it exert leadership in trying to convince the Congress that the needs of the education community must be met in the decade ahead? Or will it be, as the education establishment in the Federal Government has been in recent years, lagging somewhat behind the Congress in its willingness to recognize educational problems?

There are other possibilities for legislation with implications for community colleges that are still at the talking stage without major legislation yet available. There has been talk about technology transfer legislation, for example, as a spinoff of this new concern for basic research; one of the ideas is that the community colleges serve as a logical point for dissemination of research findings throughout the community much as the agriculature transfer agent has worked in the past. That is something, as I say, not a fully developed concept yet, but it's something we need to look at. There is in the President's budget a proposal for a new youth initiative. This has not reached the Congress yet for consideration.

There will be hearings this spring; one of the central questions with this issue is the extent to which existing programs for youth employment should involve the postsecondary institutions, and this is going to be one of the battles fought out within the community, I guess, in the next few months as to what extent the existing programs are modified to provide more emphasis on training at the postsecondary level.

Another uncertain area, but one I think is showing some signs of becoming a source of increasing support, is that of facilities. You may recall during the 1960s hundreds of millions of federal dollars were poured into the nation's campuses for construction of academic facilities and dormitories, and that tap was turned off in 1972 for very good reasons. The housing crisis and the building crisis, as far as the community as a whole, had been solved but there are new needs now--not so much for new construction but for renovation of existing facilities to meet new needs, renovation to make buildings more energy efficient in order to meet federal, state, and local standards for health and safety and to meet the federal requirements for access for the handicapped. This has been a major priority for us over the last three or four years and we finally succeeded for the first time in the 1980 budget. Congress provided $25 million as a first step for access for the handicapped--barrier removal for higher education. Senator Mathias, as a matter of fact, was one of the leading sponsors of that and without his support we never would have gotten it through. We hope that is the first step to open the door and that additional monies will flow in the coming and future years. Again, though, it is a little too early to tell yet how we are going to make out as far as making progress in this area.

In terms of the national and international picture, there are implications, very serious implications, for the higher education community in what happens on the international scene and the requirements as perceived by the Congress for building up our nation's military capacities. The question of registration and the possibility of the draft being reinstituted are to be debated in the coming months. In the meantime, the very real need of the armed services to do a better job of attracting the personnel they need is resulting in some very serious consideration on the part of the defense officials to expand educational incentives for military service. In the not too distant future, in addition to the existing student aid programs which are available to all on a need basis, there will be additional incentives provided, more generous than the current version of the G.I. Bill to provide educational benefits for service in the armed forces or the active reserve.

The major source of support from the Federal Government for higher education, and particularly for students at community colleges, will be student assistance, and those student assistance programs will be geared more closely to the needs of community college students than they have in the past.

The big thrust is clearly student aid, rather than institutional support. The search for federal support of institutions has been a will-o'-the-wisp that higher education has pursued for decades, and I don't see any real prospect of a change of attitude in the Congress on this issue in the coming decade. It seems to me that it's very clear that federal aid will be limited to specific national purposes rather than broad institutional support. At the same time, I think there are very real possibilities, if not for broad general institutional support, for obtaining a significant increase in federal support through a variety of specific national purpose programs, notably youth employment and training, facilities access for the handicapped, and possibly additional educational incentives for service in the armed forces. This whole intriguing question, but one which is still very ill-defined, is technology transfer and the relation of new research findings to the community.

Federal Support of Higher Education

I have no further guesses over the next decade, but I think assistance to individuals attending postsecondary institutions, and particulary community colleges, is the healthiest and the most sound basis on which for us to build in looking towards the pattern of federal support in the future.

THE MARYLAND FINANCIAL PICTURE AND ITS IMPLICATIONS FOR COMMUNITY COLLEGE FINANCE

Sheila Tolliver, Governor's Aide on Education

My approach is to begin by talking about the present method of funding community colleges in Maryland. Basically the State contributes to the support of community colleges in four ways: It pays directly the institutional cost of teacher social security and retirement for the community college sector; it shares in the capital cost for building the community college campuses; it has a number of State student aid programs through which student tuitions and fees may be offset; and it has a formula-based appropriation for the current expenses associated with community college education. Currently, that formula is a full-time enrollment related one and in the current fiscal year provides $800 per full-time equivalent student for most of the community colleges. There are differential rates that are paid for community colleges with very small enrollments and also for regional community colleges, bringing the average State payment this year per community college full-time equivalent student to $822. There are strengths in this approach and there are weaknesses, and there are probably some weaknesses that were strengths at one time. Tying funding to enrollment was a particularly fortunate circumstance during the last decade when enrollments were growing regularly. The marginal cost of adding a student or two or ten or fifteen was considerably smaller than the average cost per student. The same is not necessarily true in decline. You can't subtract a teacher or building quite as quickly as enrollments decline.

From the standpoint of the State Legislature, the formula that is now in use is considered desirable in that it allows for a great deal of legislative control in order for community colleges to derive an increase in the per student funding. The formula must go before the legislature, and there must be a change in the law because the numbers are actually set in the law. It also differentiates for small and regional colleges which cannot make economies of scale and whose costs are higher on a per student basis than those of the larger colleges. And finally, it reflects a delicate balance that allows for local control of the community college sector by having participation of local government in the funding. When the formula was first conceived, it was intended to represent approximately 50% of the cost per full-time equivalent student at the State level; approximately 28% was to be paid by the County, and 22% by student fees and tuitions. As costs have risen and that State's share has not risen quite so rapidly, that balance has been compromised somewhat. The formula has its problems, too. One is that it is not inflation sensitive. If inflation is 5% or 15%, there is no mechanism through which the State's allocation of money automatically is changed. There has been some divisiveness created perhaps by the differential rates paid for small and regional colleges. This year, for example, there are colleges whose enrollments are close in size to the small college enrollments around the 1,500-student mark and they're receiving the same rate of payment as Montgomery College with over 9,000 full-time equated students. Those colleges feel that the formula as it is presently conceived treats them inequitably. The formula will be deficient if community college enrollments decline or if substantial shifts in proportions of part-time students and full-time students occur as expected. The formula does not recognize that fixed costs and personnel costs do not decline directly in proportion to enrollment declines. Finally, the requirement for legislative action to effectuate statutory increases can be rather cumbersome and slow, as appropriations at the level of increase may be delayed a full year.

State Financing

With full-time equivalent costs estimated to be $2,174 per student in 1980, the State's $800 share becomes less than optimal under our present formula. There are several initiatives under way to alter this formula. Governor Hughes is sponsoring a bill which would increase the full-time equivalent payment this year to $850, and which would add $55 per full-time equivalent student to those colleges that now receive a differential. There are other competing bills which would add greater amounts of money--$100 per full-time equivalent student. The budget at this time does not support funding at that level, so if those bills were passed and the allowance were not increased in some supplemental budget, there would not be funds to support the change.

Many of you probably are aware that the State Board for Community Colleges conducted an interim study this year of community college funding. They considered a number of proposals. The one that they decided to recommend was the formula tied into the State's funding for the public four-year sector. It would have established a full-time equivalent cost per student equal to 90% of the State's general fund allocation for students in the public four-year colleges and universities, and it would have been funded at 75% of that for the first 500 students and 40% of that figure for the remaining students. There were community colleges which felt that this was less than optimal change. There were other community colleges which felt it was a very important shift. There has not been legislation this year to effectuate that change, but there will be further consideration of that and other proposals. The State Board of Community Colleges looked at, I think, about three other approaches to changing the formula, none of which they adopted. One would have tied the State's funding for community colleges to guidelines for funding. The State Board for Higher Education has guidelines for funding the public colleges and universities, and there could have been an adaptation of those for the community college sector or there could have been another set of guidelines developed. There were also a number of proposals considered that simply built an increase at varying levels to the present formula structure. There was a proposal that would tie the community college funding to the local subdivision's wealth, and there would be an inverse relationship between the State's payment and the local ability to pay. So in a community like Montgomery County, your State payment per student would be lower, for example, than would the State's payment in Cecil County which is among the lower wealth counties in Maryland. They also rejected that one. And, the final set that they considered were proposals to tie the State's funding in some way to the funding that we have in the State colleges and universities. It was that option that they actually finalized in their last recommendation.

The Governor's proposal for this year would require a $2.8 million increase in general funds, bringing the support of community colleges up to the neighborhood of $50 million. It would result in a State-wide average per full-time equivalent student of $883, although for Montgomery College and all large colleges, it would be $850. It has been said that the Governor's proposal may provide some unfair advantage for larger schools like Montgomery as compared to what it does for smaller colleges, but no one sees it as a particular windfall to anyone. It is considered a modest, interim increase. The legislative proposal for $100 increase per full-time equivalent student would cost $5.5 million extra this year and would result in an average full-time equivalent cost of $922. Those legislative proposals do not recommend a similar adjustment in the regional and small college program, and that's why the average cost per FTE is somewhat smaller and closer to the Governor's proposal than you might expect. The State Board for Community College proposal would eliminate the necessity to have differential rates. Everyone could be treated on the same basis. It would result in an average fund per full-time equivalent student of $893, which is $10 more per student than the administration planned. It probably would have cost between $500,000 and $800,000 in the first year; however, it would have had a built-in incremental effect as long as the State's funding for higher education in general were increased. The counties with the largest colleges with growing full-time equivalent student counts felt that they would be somewhat disadvantaged by a shift to this kind of program.

The guideline funding approaches that the community college board considered would have yielded a greater fund according to the community college board but would have also probably resulted in greater State control of the community college sector and greater scrutiny of local college budgets. There is some debate about the effectiveness of the guidelines used by State Board for Higher Education for funding in that they also are tied to enrollments.

The equalization proposals are built on the model that is used in the elementary and secondary schools. The constitution of the State requires that the elementary and secondary schools be funded in a way that results in equal educational opportunity for all students. There is no equivalent constitutional requirement for the community college sector, so there's a less compelling argument for moving into that direction. It's probably true that low wealth counties are somewhat disadvantaged in terms of soliciting extra local support in lean years.

I turn now to some future directions for community college funding. First of all, the Governor, during his gubernatorial campaign, pledged to take a comprehensive look at state and local fiscal relationships. The equivalent of about 50% of the State's general fund budget is returned annually to the local governments. There is a tremendous sharing of resources. I believe Maryland ranks number 1 in sharing State's resources with local governments. This is done through a number of aid programs. It is not simply a revenue sharing program. The complexity has gotten greater and greater over the years, and it appeared that this would be a good time to take a look at whether or not the resulting distribution was really the direction the State wanted to take. That task force, the State-Local Fiscal Relationships Task Force, has been deliberating now for something less than a year. They were given as their top priorities in the past year transportation and public elementary and secondary education funding. If the legislature approves the Governor's bills and budget, we will see a $67 million increase in public elementary and secondary education, in spite of an enrollment decline that's greater than 4% per year, and $70 million of new aid for transportation. It may please you to know, having given you those large figures, that community colleges are on the priority list for the coming year's study by this task force.

The kind of factors that influence the future trend in funding community colleges at the State level are not substantially different from those that were given as influencing the Federal level. The State's highest priority in terms of where its funds go is public education. If you are considering all kinds of funds, Federal, State, and special fund fee collections which are student tuitions and other kinds of special fees, the State spends almost 31% of its budget in support of education; approximately 12% of that is in support of higher education. If you look only at the State's funds, 36% of the State's general fund are directed to support of public education, so it is a high priority. To increase its proportional share by simply one percentage point means substantial reduction in one or more of those other areas because there is no competitor in terms of receiving State funds that comes even close to education.

It is also important to look at where the money comes from, and you see that 22.8% of the State's budget comes from Federal funds, so the future of Federal fund resources will make a difference in the kind of flexibility we have with the State's resources. One of the kinds of Federal funds that is an endangered species is the Federal Revenue sharing money. If the State does lose its share of Federal Revenue sharing money, which has been a popular target at the Federal level, then our capability will be reduced in terms of increasing the kinds of expenditures we make at the State level. In all kinds of programs, I believe we derive about $45 million a year from that source alone. By far the largest source of funds for the State is the income tax and probably you know that incomes have not been rising at the same rate as inflation in the last couple of years. Therefore, the taxes derived from that source, if the rate stays constant, will not be sufficient even to match inflation. We're considered in Maryland to be somewhat protected from high unemployment rates that plague the nation because of our high proportion of governmental jobs, and in Montgomery County you may be even more protected than some other areas of the State. Nevertheless, the income tax bears a direct relationship to the employment rate and to the salary rate. Whenever salary growth is less than inflationary growth, there will be less revenue available to support increases beyond inflationary levels and even up to inflationary levels. Another 25% of the budget is derived from user taxes. In an economic downturn, the taxes derived from that source are likely to be reduced as well. Other serious threats to the State's financial health are the various proposals for tax and spending limitations both at the local and State level. Several bills are before the legislature this session that take a variety of approaches to taxation and spending limitations. Some would limit the State's growth to a standard percentage; some would limit the proportion of the salary that could be taxed--all kinds of approaches. They all have the same general thrust, which is to reduce the growth of government; therefore to reduce the amount of revenue that's available to spend on program improvement. The California experience is an important one to look at. When local limitations were placed on California's budget, the State's role in funding education jumped all the way to 80%. Those subdivisions which were spending a great deal of local money on public education, such as Beverly Hills, had to reduce their participation in local education and the result was that the programs were cut back severely. Now that California also has a state's spending limitation ceiling of 4%, they're predicting further doom and gloom in expenditures for education and other programs as well. Regardless of spending limitations at the state level, elementary and secondary education are constitutionally required to be available and equitable. A threat of spending limitations is that the decision-making for education expenditures will be removed from the state legislature and the local government and will be moved to the courts. People will test the equity or the adequacy of the state's financial structure in the courts, and the courts can then impose a financing structure that exceeds the limitation of the state.

The economic forecast for Maryland over a five year period has been prepared by the legislature's fiscal services. The State's financial shape after this legislative session is predicted to include a deficiency of $18.2 million, and there would continue to be deficiencies for the next several years unless there were a tax increase. The State's Constitution does not allow the State to operate under deficiencies. So, obviously, spending would either have to be reduced, revenues would have to turn out to be larger than projected, or taxes would have to be increased to maintain the kinds of program recommendations that are before the legislature.

The State's perspective in looking at its various aid programs must be broad. In looking at the aid proposal for community colleges, the focus must include the total package of State Aid to local government. This year's proposed legislative package by the Governor does include substantial increases in State Aid to local government. These will cost about $150 million of the surplus in the coming fiscal year. Montgomery County would have lost $6.4 million if there were no change in the aid programs that deliver funds back to local governments. Under the proposed package which includes a substantial increase for transportation which affects Montgomery County because of Metro and which also includes a substantial increase in State Aid for public education, Montgomery County will see a net increase of $12 million in State Aid. Only $462,000 of this comes from the community college aid formula; however, counties traditionally have utilized new sources of state support to free up local resources. These resources have been applied to whatever local priorities may be pressing that year. The overall increase in State Aid for Montgomery County equals about seven cents on your local property tax rate. These increases in State Aid are important. They're necessary, but they are for the most part recurring expenditures rather than one-time expenditures. That means that future year revenues are depleted in advance by the built-in growth factors in these aid programs, and that makes the forecast for Maryland less than optimistic.

The final thing that I was asked to talk about was how you might influence the decision-making in regard to community college funding. I think the advice you received from earlier speakers is good, and that is to use the system. In the State, you have a State Board for Community Colleges and you have a State Board for Higher Education, both of which have a great deal of influence in determining the policy for education and education funding. There is a faculty advisory council to the State Board for Higher Education with community college representation which could be a powerful force, I believe. It is helpful to come together in a united voice when you're appealing for higher education funding. One of the great threats of the economic gloom of the future is that we may find divisiveness among the segments of higher education in competing for those limited dollars. That may be inevitable, but I think you could be instrumental in seeing that it doesn't happen and doesn't negatively impact on higher education funding as a whole by coming together and speaking with a unified voice. We are fortunate to have a system that gives us an opportunity to do that. Also, I think it will be important that the community college sector participate in the interim study of the State-Local Fiscal Relationships Task Force. That task force has an enormous job because they're talking about the apportioning of an amount equivalent to 50% of the State's general fund budget. The Community College Board already has a good start because they have studied community college funding and they have tested the waters on some of their proposals. They can give good advice, good experience to the task force, and I think that would be a helpful mechanism for influencing decision-making in the coming year.

Finally, if the recommendations that you wish to put before the State Legislature involve large new expenditures, it's helpful to be able to present to those legislators the source of revenue to support those expenditures. There's some futility in bringing a need and not letting the legislator know how to go about financing it. That's going to be a real challenge of the future--not only in higher education but in all State services.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT PLANS FOR MONTGOMERY COUNTY

Margaret Cudney, Public Information Officer for the
Montgomery County Office of Economic Development

During the 60's and into the 70's, Montgomery County experienced a steadily increasing employment and population growth as companies and corporations located in the County, despite the fact that little if anything purposeful was done to attract them. During the last several decades, the County has also benefited immensely from the steady growth of the Federal Government.

During the last five years, however, we have found ourselves in a much different sort of situation with development not decreasing but leveling off. We have seen one of our basic sources of employment and business--the Federal Government--turn down, as it has attempted to retrench and restrict federal spending compared to what we experienced in previous years.

In your compendium of materials for the conference is an outline of the economic development presentation. The first question it asks, of course, is "Why a program for economic development? Hasn't the County always had a program? We have always had an Office of Economic Development, but it wasn't until a couple of years ago that we started to think more seriously about some of the implications of this slowdown in federal employment and in the hitherto spontaneous development of new private corporations, many of them providing services to the Federal Government.

At that point several steps were taken, one of which was to involve the private sector in providing some advice toward planning for the future. An Economic Development Advisory Board was appointed with representatives from many top companies in Montgomery County. We benefited from access to the ideas and input from these corporate executives for almost two years. Executives from our local companies donated hours of time and expertise to consideration of some of the major problems facing economic development. Two reports were prepared by the Economic Development Advisory Board in cooperation with the Office of Economic Development; and many of the recommendations contained in those reports have been implemented during the past year.

In addition, the Office of Economic Development was recently reorganized. It was formerly a part of a department, Community and Economic Development, that has been completely restructured by the County Executive. Another one of the Executive's campaign pledges, which he has continued to give high priority to since taking office more than a year ago, was renewed emphasis on economic development. In connection with this pledge, a reorganization has taken place which makes the Office of Economic Development a separate department of the County Government, directly responsible to the Executive. We are also slated to get two or three more staff people, which still doesn't mean that we will have a very large staff. Currently, we have nine people. We will be expanding to 11 or 12 in Fiscal Year 1981. So in terms of large amounts of money being spent on economic development, that simply isn't the case. In terms of a very large staff, that isn't the case either. However, we have had a very good year, and I'll be mentioning something about that later.

Our major thrust has not been to go out and aggressively beat the bushes in an effort to get companies to come, despite what you may have been reading in the newspapers lately about new corporations coming into the County--however, we are delighted to welcome them. Our present program primarily emphasizes assistance to existing businesses, because 80 percent of our new jobs come from existing business expansions. We are proud of what we already have in Montgomery County, and we are anxious to build on that and make it possible for companies that are here already to grow and expand and continue to prosper in Montgomery County.

This is our first and most important priority. In that connection, we have implemented a program of visitation to businesses. The County Executive personally supports this program and has participated in many of the visits to learn about the problems our businesses are having and the type of assistance they need.

There are several State programs available for financing expansion plans. Montgomery County has a great deal to offer businesses in terms of the total community. In trying to assist any expension or even to assist new businesses wishing to locate here, we stress the County's unique location so close to the Nation's Capital, our skilled labor pool, and our outstanding quality of life. We believe quality of life is one of our biggest assets and selling points. Hand-in-hand with encouraging expansions and attracting new business, we try to insure that the business will contribute to the continuation of that quality, and we do certain things to insure that that is so. For example, we have been working with Montgomery College--and we hope to be doing a great deal more of that--to meet the training needs of existing and future employees and employers.

In that connection, I started to mention a recent business visit. Among the major manpower needs of that particular company were certain selected skills. In the Office of Economic Development we try to serve as a catalyst, bringing together the needs of a business that might really be experiencing some labor shortage and the offerings of the College, which is very much concerned about and interested in meeting training needs in the community.

One company we visited recently has had such a serious problem of locating qualified entry-level people that they have considered leaving the County. We do all we can to prevent such an occurrence. It happens but not often. Some of the visits we have made this year have paid off in terms of actual expansion plans being announced, and there are many others in the offing which the County has been able to assist. The County Executive and the County Government in

44

general are very interested in finding out what the specific needs of businesses are and what factors may be hampering them from doing what they want to do.

As far as our overall goals, one is increasing the tax base. We have been talking about the conflicting or competing needs that will result from the need to provide various kinds of services for METRO, to supply programs and services geared to an older population and fewer high school graduates, etc. In the last few years the commercial-industrial tax base in the County has decreased. It was about 20 percent of the total in 1972. But by 1977, it was down at the 14 percent level. One reason for economic development is to increase the commercial-industrial tax base--to have more businesses in the County that will be contributing to that tax base, thus taking some of the burden off the residential taxpayer. So we not only want to improve the overall economic vitality of the County, but we want to expand the non-residential tax base and generate employment opportunities for County residents. We want to have a balanced business base that will provide opportunities for all types of business, particularly small and minority business, and we are developing strategies to encourage and support that. One that we worked on with the College was a Procurement Trade Fair.

Another important aspect of economic development is to communicate to our citizens what we are and are not doing. Some citizens get frightened about additional development and wonder what we are really doing. We do not intend to promote wall-to-wall asphalt--or smokestacks of any kind! We are looking for clean industry, more of the same high technology industry we already have. We want to promote sound and sustained economic growth that is planned and not haphazard. And we want to assist the County's agricultural community to remain viable and to preserve farmland. We have an ongoing agricultural program within our Office--supervised by an agricultural coordinator who provides liaison between the County and the farm community.

We would like to see the commercial-industrial segment of the tax base go back up to around 20 percent of the total. This past year it did go up from 15 to 16.8 percent; so we have moved up somewhat. The growth of population has slowed down in the County, but the number of people in the labor force has jumped dramatically due to the increase in new households and a rise in the number of families with multiple wage earners. We had a growth in employment from 261,000 to 271,000 in the County from September '78 through October '79. We don't yet have the figures for the rest of '79. It's interesting to note that most of the new jobs were in the private sector. Thus, we are not a bedroom community to the Federal Government any longer, as is sometimes thought of Montgomery County. The federal sector employment has leveled off, and we have substantial private sector employment. Sixty percent of the County's total labor force of 316,000 work here in the County. It also proves that we don't have everybody commuting downtown to D.C. With spiraling inflation and the energy crisis, there will be more and more need to have jobs closer to people's homes. Also, more and more second wage earners, women and new people entering the work force, etc. will be able to find jobs closer to their homes.

As far as attraction of new businesses this year. we have participated in several important announcements. Southern Pacific Communications Corporation is going to build near Montgomery Mall. That was announced in October. GEISCO (General Electric Information Services) of Rockville is planning to buy a 212-acre tract of land near Gaithersburg and build a new headquarters there. In terms of the expansion of existing businesses, we have also announced Bio-Tech Research Lab in Rockville and Beltway Limousine in Silver Spring, among others.

As I mentioned earlier, we are hoping to attract some more of the same kind of firms we've attracted in the past, i.e., high technology firms--telecommunications, computer services, medical science firms, associations, and the like. Some seven firms have announced their intention either to locate or expand in the County in the last six months, and these firms represent a total investment of more than $180 million. They will generate tax revenues of approximately $2 million in property taxes alone.

As far as assistance to small and minority businesses, I mentioned the Procurement Trade Fairs, which we have organized for two years in cooperation with the College and the Montgomery County Chamber of Commerce. We have several joint projects of that nature. Another one is production of a new Directory of Businesses, which is being updated as part of a project coordinated by Richard Beall, a Montgomery College employee.

The first Maryland Industrial Development Financing Authority (MIDFA) loan was awarded to a small firm. And recently, Montgomery County established its own guidelines for MIDFA loans, specifically aimed at addressing the needs of smaller businesses. There had been a $2 million investment, but that requirement has been eliminated.

We have implemented several other measures to improve government responsiveness to private industry. That was one of the major recommendations made by the Economic Development Advisory Board. Often we would hear about the problems private developers were having with the development authorization process and all the hassle they'd have to endure. For those of you who work in development, I trust that you have seen improvement in the last year. We have a fast-track system that works through the permit processes. We also have what is called Technical Advisory Board, or TAB, that was established this past year. It is a board of top executives of all the County and Bi-County agencies that have anything to do with the development process-Park and Planning, WSSC, Environmental Protection, Transportation, and the Office of Economic Development, of course. It is chaired by our Chief Administrative Officer, Bob Wilson. It meets on a regular basis and addresses the development issues of businesses engaged in expansions or planning to locate here. Problems are addressed before they have an opportunity to become critical, and a lot of time is saved. Time is money and very important to the builder and developer.

Working with several other County agencies and the private sector, we are also trying to stimulate new investment in downtown Silver Spring. In support of the commercial revitalization project in that area, the County is putting in approximately $23 million in public improvements. One of these is $3.5 million for streetscaping in the Silver Spring area. The streetscaping has already been started on Colesville Road and will extend along Georgia. Silver Spring, one of the County's major central business districts, has lost out in recent years to migration to the suburbs and the growth of suburban malls for shopping. This project along with the public sector's commitment will stimulate private investment in the area.

For the first time, the Office of Economic Development has a marketing contract with the local firm of Kal, Merrick and Salan, Inc. We also have a small public relations contract. This year we are using it primarily to develop publications and programs that we need for our outreach. We haven't aggressively advertised because that is very expensive and our budget is not that big. Anyway, we don't view aggressive selling as being compatible with the image of Montgomery County or with our goal of attracting only certain kinds of firms.

Governor Hughes and the State of Maryland have also increased their commitment to economic development. Last November the State sponsored a reverse investment mission to Europe, and our office participated. Contracts were made with a number of firms in England, France and Germany. About 15 solid prospects resulted. This was a total State effort, of course. As a result of the European trip, one representative of a German firm is visiting our office this week. We hope the visit will culminate in a new investment in Montgomery County by an international firm.

There is a lot more that we could talk about but I believe those are the highlights. We have developed a conference and visitors guide and hope to stimulate the conference industry here. The guide describes the facilities we have now and their size and amenities. A number of conferences are already held in the County, but we do not yet have a large convention facility. A large facility is important for the bigger conferences we would like to attract. Such conferences are a good source of revenue and jobs. At the moment, however, we are trying to assist with the marketing of the facilities we already have and encourage their optimum use. There are presently some possibilities for some new hotels/ and/or a conference center in several parts of the County, particularly in Silver Spring and Rockville.

Anyway, we think we have just about all we need in terms of resources right here in the County, particularly with the College. We are looking forward to working even more closely with the College to tailor programs to fit the needs of businesses along the I-270 Corridor and elsewhere in the County. Also we're about to announce a new business that will be coming soon on the Route 29 Corridor, an area which we think has lots of possibility for future investment and commercial development.

TRANSPORTATION IN MONTGOMERY COUNTY IN THE 1980s

John Clark, Assistant Director, Office of Transportation Planning,
Montgomery County Department of Transportation

I think there's a tendency to overestimate the future, and the further you go into the future, the greater the overestimate. I remember years ago reading about the exotic transportation systems of the future. Everybody was going to be going around in a plastic capsule hung from an elevated monorail and we were going to resolve all of the traffic jams. Ships on the sea would travel 50 knots an hour with hydrofoils. And we were going to have something called personal rapid transit. People would have mini-helicopters in their backyards. These ideas are still around, but they're still on paper, and I don't think you are going to see very many of them put into practical use in their pure exotic forms. There is a tendency to rename systems--calling a taxi service a dial-a-ride. We think of that as a new system, but that hasn't really changed the basic mode.

From the government point of view, practicality is one of the essential ingredients in any system. It has to work--it can't work only 50 percent of the time or even only 90 percent of the time. The system must provide service 100 percent of the time. If the system breaks down--even if a traffic signal fails--the whole network seems to go haywire.

A number of factors in Montgomery County will affect the future of transportation. When the subway systems are completed, there will be a significant change. The number of residents of Montgomery County employed in the District of Columbia is about 25 percent. About 55 percent of Montgomery County residents are employed in the county, so the system will serve very well the people going to the District of Columbia but may not serve as well the people working in Montgomery County unless they work on the line and live on the line.

Another factor is the increase in population and jobs in the County. From a commercial developer's point of view, it is a very attractive area to locate here on the fringe of the Nation's Capital; we have good public facilities and we increase jobs at a faster rate than the population. Another factor is the higher cost of gasoline and diesel fuel. We like to think costs are going to level off sometime, but they are still going to be significant costs. A greater factor would be the shortage of petroleum. We produce only about half of the petroleum we use. If even the percentage is cut back, it causes severe disruptions in the delivery system of gasoline and other petroleum products. If anything like that should happen on a permanent basis, severe change in the transportation systems will be required.

Another factor I see is citizen concerns. It is harder and harder to get needed facilities built. I've mentioned greater densities--obviously increased density calls for more transportation facilities and yet those who are creating those densities tend to be opponents of the facilities if they perceive the facilities will negatively affect them. Higher housing costs will be another factor. You might assume that with higher housing cost, you would have to economize on space and have townhouses in lieu of single-family homes and have apartment houses in lieu of townhouses. The greater the density of housing again, the greater the opportunity you would have for ride-sharing, taxi, transit, walking, or van pooling.

TRANSPORTATION IN MONTGOMERY COUNTY IN THE 1980s

Kay Stevens, Chief, Planning and Program Section,
Montgomery County Department of Transportation

First let's step back and see where we have come from, up to this point. We've seen the opening of the Silver Spring Metro Station in February 1978. Along with that we saw a major expansion of the Ride-On bus system in Silver Spring, growing from 14 to 55 buses, a major expansion at that time showing commitment by the County to transit and bus access to Metrorail. County subsidies for transit service (I'm including Metrorail, Metrobus and the Ride-On bus systems) have risen from $6.2 million in 1976 to $11.5 million today.

The County sees an increasing role in the coming years for transit to relieve roadway congestion, conserve energy, and improve air quality. In the future you will see the opening of the Shady Grove Metrorail line--current estimate is the Fall of 1983. We hope Metro can stick to that time schedule. The County has been making commitments to expand its community based Ride-On bus service along with the opening of these Metrorail stations. The County is discussing initiating the Ride-On service into both Rockville and Bethesda. Whether these will be separate services, or eventually become part of a large up-county/down-county Ride-On service, hasn't been worked out. But there is a commitment within the County government that there will be an increasing amount of support for transit access to the Metrorail system.

However, it's going to cost money. The subsidy right now for transit services is $11.5 million. The projection is that if the public continues to support Ride-On access to the Metrorail stations, you could possibly see subsidies to the tune of $21 million in 1986 after the Shady Grove and the Glenmont lines are open. Today it is estimated there are 28 million people riding transit. By 1986 our department is projecting that there will be 48 million people riding transit (in these ridership figures I'm including commuter rail).

In addition to transit access to Metrorail stations, there is also an increasing trend towards improving roadway access to the Metrorail stations. Not everybody is going to be able to take a bus. Bus service isn't economic in medium to low density areas, and people are still going to be driving carpools and will be dropped off at the Metrorail stations. There are numerous roadway projects planned near the Metro stations which the buses will also travel on; thus, many of these road improvements will also help bus access at the same time as improving auto access.

The County is trying to improve the fringe parking facilities we have available. There are studies underway to try to locate what would be good prime sites for people to park and ride. We already have a number of fringe parking lots where there is good transit service.

Our department has also been working to provide bicycle parking facilities at Metro stations. There already are bike lockers available on a rental basis at the Silver Spring Metro station which are fairly well utilized. We also are developing bike maps so people can learn about which are the good bicycle routes to work sites or transit stations.

We also are trying to improve pedestrian access in terms of sidewalks and traffic light improvements.

Another thing you have to look forward to in the future is improvement to the commuter rail system. By commuter rail, I mean the B&O trains that run through the western part of Montgomery County, Gaithersburg, Rockville, Kensington, Silver Spring and south into Union Station. It's a fairly large commuter run, carrying 1,600 Montgomery County residents a day. In 1983 when the Shady Grove Metro line opens up, there will be a combined commuter rail-Metrorail station at Rockville so you can transfer from one system to the other. In addition the State Railroad Administration is studying whether there should be a transfer facility at Silver Spring. A new commuter rail station is planned to be built in the Metropolitan Grove area in the northern part of Gaithersburg, hopefully by the end of this year. That will relieve the parking problems at the commuter rail station in downtown Gaithersburg and allow for future expansion. The County will improve most of the historic commuter rail stations along the line, trying to preserve the station buildings in Kensington and Dickerson. We're going to reconstruct the station in Germantown. In addition, at the up-county commuter rail stations we will expand the parking facilities so that people in these areas will have an opportunity to ride transit; they can then ride the commuter rail service all the way to downtown Washington, they can ride it into Rockville and transfer to Metro, or they can ride it into Rockville or Silver Spring and go to work. The State Road Administration has a grant to increase the capacity on the commuter rail line. They're hoping to expand the seating capacity by 100% within the next couple of years. This "rolling stock" improvement will be taking place concurrently with improvements to the stations.

Even with all this, we still see the automobile continuing to play the predominant role in transportation in the County. But I would say that with the increasing cost of gasoline, people are going to start thinking about alternatives. Another of these alternatives is going to be ride-sharing. The County is fully committed to supporting ride-sharing. By ride-sharing I mean both car pooling and van pooling. Montgomery County was the first county in the Washington area to actively support van pooling and provide a program in which people could get into van pools. A van pool is where 12 to 15 people get together in a van and drive to and from work. In Montgomery County any group from 12 to 15 people can lease a van on a monthly basis for commuting. We have estimated that each van pool takes eight cars off the road and saves an average of 5,000 gallons of gas a year. We think there are good strong benefits to van pooling. Within just one year of this operation of this program, we've got over 40 van pools on the roads in Montgomery County. That's over 600 people participating in van pooling.

We work with the Council of Governments on both car pooling and van pooling. The Council of Governments is the metropolitan regional planning organization, and they have a computer based system that will match people for car pools. If you send in your name to them, they will send you back a computer-matched list of other people who live and work in similar locations and who go to work at approximately the same time.

The Planning Commission has been sponsoring a demonstration ride-sharing program within the Silver Spring central business district, where people coming to work sites in Silver Spring have a "personalized" system of matching people for car pools and van pools. More than 600 people are registered in this program.

In the ride-sharing area, there has been additional support in parking opportunities. In certain parking lots in the Silver Spring and Bethesda areas, car pools can get priority parking at a reduced fee. In addition, we have been working closely with the Planning Commission to obtain reserved parking spaces for van pools at certain recreation areas.

SOCIAL CHARACTERISTICS

SOCIAL CHARACTERISTICS OF THE POPULATION IN THE 1980s

Harold L. Hodgkinson, President
National Training Laboratories

One of the reasons I'm here and one of the things we'll have to think about as we think past the issue of new populations and what we can do in this particular community college is some of these larger agenda items which I think are going to be very important for community colleges in the next few years.

When you think of coordinating the interface between local, state and federal authority, the community college is a very clear, crucial agency to do that. It also seems to me that the elementary, secondary and higher education coordination spectrum, is another in which community colleges can play a significant role. In addition, it seems to me that community colleges now are one of the major interfaces and linkage points between industrial systems of higher education, military, and various community agencies that have an increasing role to play in education. It's important, I think, to put in context the notion of population shift, because it is never seen as an entity unto itself.

The reason we look at pictures is that there's a lot of data saying that's how people learn. If you want people to retain something, there are two things you can do. You can associate that learning with a picture or you can inject them with about 2 cc. of uric acid solution. Uric acid solution is remarkably effective in increasing people's short-term memory. It's also a substance which gave people gout in the 18th century. Given the shortage of hypodermic needles, I suggest that we use pictures because it is about as effective. It does suggest, though, that the teaching in community colleges ought to take account of the data. If that is how people learn in terms of long-term associations through visual images, maybe it's time we started revising our teaching to reflect that fact.

Social Characteristics of the Population in the 1980s

Three states of higher education in the United States are heavily based on changes in the population. From 1860 to 1930, the population was remarkably constant and, therefore, the aristocratic era made sense. We had a stable upper-class in this country, and they built colleges to educate their own. Every 10 years, they let in some middle class kids so they could argue that they were being liberal. That was the period in which populations were remarkably constant as far as social class in the country was concerned. After World War II, however, large numbers of young people who had been hatched in the Levittowne thing right after World War II began aspiring to more than their parents were capable of or had achieved and moved toward higher education as the major method of accomplishing a more interesting future than their parents had been able to manage. So it was a period in which there was much interest in rejecting as many as these aspirants as possible and thus we developed a test which is the easiest and cheapest way of keeping people out of college ever known, the Scholastic Aptitude Test. This test is interesting to me because aptitudes are not public domain. If you tell somebody that they got a 543 on the SAT Verbal, they can do nothing about that; it's not diagnostic, they can't work harder to get a better score on the next one. And, of course, the interesting thing with me about SAT Verbal scores is that they correlate neither with the ability to speak nor with the ability to write. If you have a verbal aptitude measure that doesn't correlate with speaking and it doesn't correlate with writing, what have you got? And, indeed, the fact that these are not public domain aptitudes is extremely interesting. Nobody ever touched, smelled, felt, or listed to an aptitude. They are not part of the public exercise regarding education.

We move from than then, because of the population shifts, into a new concern with an egalitarian mission. This is the time when enrollments began to slack off and we began to realize that we're not going to be youth-oriented culture forever.

As a result of these population changes, we developed a far more egalitarian mission. There is no point in rejecting as many people as you can if you're dealing with a declining cohort because, if that's the case, you're committing a kamikaze mission and most of us don't like to do that. Therefore, in the egalitarian era, we changed the ideology to match the qualities of the demography we had to live with, a declining number of 18 year olds.

Now, look at what we did in colleges during that period in order to diversify our student bodies and to meet that mission. It's remarkable to see how many changes took place in college enrollments, especially for women and blacks; it's also true for Hispanics but not as much a factor in the national data during that period. It's clear that we were able to meet that meritocratic mission by expanding our facilities and by meeting the needs of those specific individuals--for women so that they could attain a reasonable access to the job market and for blacks and other minorities. In addition to race and sex, colleges have become very much more diversified by age. Fifteen years ago if you were 60 years of age and walked into a college and said you wanted to enroll as a student they would have laughted you off campus. Today, we have a million and a half students over 55 enrolled as college students. Six hundred institutions offer special courses for them.

I bring to your attention briefly the case of Ed Clark. Ed is 65 and two years ago he finally got his bachelor's degree from Georgetown University. That was 44 years after he was thrown out of Amherst for the sin of sins, getting married three credits short of graduation. Ed has since compiled 60 college credits at the level of A. He has been back to Amherst on four occasions with his transcripts from those other institutions showing 60 credits of A and has said, "please, sir, do these 60 credits of A work at other institutions make up for the three credits short of graduation because I got married?" The answer has been very consistent, "Ed, you made your decision, now you have to live with it." Amherst, as you probably know, is Nathaniel Hawthorne country and Ed has on occasion felt that perhaps the Scarlet Letter and Hester Prinn were related in some way except the scarlet letter that he has on his breast doesn't say adultery; it says Amherst. You talk to Deans of Students now about getting married before graduation and they throw up their hands and say, "Gee, if only they would do that, most of our problems would be solved."

If you look at high school completion rates, in 1951 one out of four blacks graduated from high school and only half the whites in the United States were high school graduates. We assume that everybody has always graduated from high school. There's no sense of history. But, as a matter of fact, from 1950 to 1975 an enormous revolution took place in this country in terms of who should go to institutions of education. Now, we have three-quarters of the blacks graduating from high school and 85% of the whites and there has been virtually no decline in test scores. Most test scores did not decline even though we're now doing with three-quarters of the cohort what we used to do with 50%. That, to my mind, is a social achievement which is the equivalent of putting a man on the moon technologically and yet we get very little credit for completing an agenda for the top half, and we basically now can guarantee a college education for everybody in the United States in the top half of the youth cohort.

Let's look now at some of the demography that we have to consider in planning our future. When you think about demography, you have to start with the largest unit and work down. The largest unit I know is the world. And, here's the world's population for 1970 to 2000 and it scares me to death. The enormous increase from 1980 to 2000 is all over here. Those are rather strange people, they don't eat the same things that we do for breakfast, they don't dress the same, their values are different. These are going to be very youth-oriented cultures because that's where the population is going to be and thus, internationally, we might want to start with that kind of situation.

Do institutions of higher education adapt to population conditions? I think the answer is absolutely, yes. There are now about 24 centers for distance learning in the world. These are places in which by definition you have sparsely populated areas with maybe 50 to 100 miles between students. In that kind of situation you simply have to evolve some new kind of educational system and of course this is what's happened. It's interesting that with our lead in technological development we are not the world leaders in distance learning. Indeed, many of the installations in Sri Lanka are far more sophisticated in terms of their use of a variety of media and testing techniques than we are in the United States. So there's much to learn, but it does suggest that demography can determine to some extent the kind of educational presentation that we make.

Why is there so much interest in lifelong learning today and why are we so dedicated to the mission of teaching adults? It's largely because we're about to run out of 18 year olds. In many cases, as in Wisconsin for example, it's either cows which outnumber the people almost 2 to 1, or it's older students. Because most of us aren't licensed to work with cows, we have to work with something else. By 1995 the population in the conventional age level is going to be roughly similar to what it was in 1960. Look at college catalogs for 1960 and that will be roughly the public expectation for where you ought to be in 1995 because you'll have an equivalence in terms of the eligible pool. That means that if we want to increase the appropriations for higher education, we're going to have to be very, very persuasive. I think it can be done but it won't be done automatically.

High school graduates in the United States, as you know, were big in 1978 and from 1978 on, it's downhill all the way. Now, if you're really patient and if you have a good sense of fortitude, if you can wait around awhile, 1997 is going to be a terrific year. By 1997 we begin going back up, but remember that it's a long way from here to there. Notice also in this chart, however, that non-white populations in the 18 to 24 year old group are remarkably similar in that they do not change; it is the white middle class that's responsible for the birthrate decline. Thus, a higher percentage of college eligible young people have minority group backgrounds. That, I think, will even have an impact on areas like this one, in counties like this one. Births then do determine, to a large extent, 18 years later educational policy in the United States for high schools and colleges.

The birthrate data by region for the United States is really quite fascinating, because of the fact that by 1973 in the west, we had already started a spectacular increase in births, whereas for the northeast it was still going down; thus, the country was getting much more diverse in terms of where babies were being born, and they were not being born in New England. They were being born in the west, and as a result we have a very real Marxist problem in the future if you think of Marxism by age of having one area of the country which will be dominated by young people. That tends to be the sun belt giving aside Florida. The northeast and the so-called frost belt states will be dominated by older folks.

Here then is what high school graduates look like and that's simply an extension of that chart that you just saw with a few changes. As you can see, the west is planning for a major increase in high school graduates, whereas the northeast is having a calamitous time. Where will federal policy be drawn on the issue of student aid for colleges? It'll be drawn along this line which is the national mean. The fact that no students are at that line is of little concern to the Congress of the United States. But, for those 10 states that are showing significant increases in youth population, they will be fighting a losing battle over the next decade because Congress is not prepared for the fact that the United States population of young people is increasing--it's not. Those 10 states then are going to have to swim upstream in order to get appropriations increased. They tend to be the sun belt. The frost belt is down and down spectacularly. In some states, Minnesota will probably have to close one of its state colleges in the next two years, and you want a political nightmare try to close a state college. The particular one that's going to close had an anticipated enrollment of this year of 15,000 students and the current enrollment is 1,100. Fifteen thousand was the projection--the current enrollment is 1,100.

The political balance of the United States moves west of the Mississippi with the 1980 census for the first time. Where are the new jobs located? They're in the sun belt. All of these things change the dynamics of the United States because the majority of our citizens will live west of the Mississippi. In addition, census takers and others who like to do projections have come up with some entertaining data these days. Your chance of getting killed by being run over by a snowplow dropped 50% in the last five years. The reason is obvious--nobody lives where the snowplows are. On the other hand, your chance of being killed in an earthquake went up 30% because everybody is now in the west.

As new jobs develop, especially in the professions and semi-professions, the sun belt becomes much more attractive. Thus, you find an even more interesting thing which we haven't talked about much in the country, and that's the brain drain. One of the things that's happening to the sun belt is that a lot of terribly intelligent people are moving there--people with advanced degrees, so the fact that people are moving around in the United States is important, particularly if you think that I.Q. in the United States is equal by region, you'd better go look at the data because the southeast has always had an I.Q. level of about 8 to 10 points below the northeast up until about five years ago when they started to equalize.

Social Characteristics of the Population in the 1980s

Let's look a little closer at Maryland. The best data I know of for State projections on high school graduates show Maryland data peaking in about 1979 and then it's straight down until 1995. You're ahead of the national projection by about one year because you start up a little earlier than the rest of the nation does. So that's a way of thinking about where you are and clearly your population of high school graduates in the state will follow the national trend. Let me show you some of the national ways of thinking about this. In the United States in 1986 the high school graduates will be off 18% from what they were in the base year of 1979. By 1988 it's 13%, by 1991 it's 26% and 1995 it's 22%. These are measures of decline. The northeast is hit very, very hard with a 40% decline compared to 26% for the country as a whole. The northeast is significantly worse off than Maryland. So the Maryland data suggest decline but not as much decline as the rest of the northeast.

What can you do about all of this? Here's what one community college district in Wisconsin did. They looked at their 19 year old eligible population and discovered that it was underwhelming; that by 1995 they were going to have to do something else or go out of business. What they did then was to project out each of the age cohorts to see if they had any growth area that they could find. They had a major increase in 25 to 34 year olds in that particular district and in those over 65. So they began gearing their future curriculum and teaching methods around the age levels that are going to become the fastest growing part of that particular service area. They're doing extremely well at the present. So the fact that you're going down in 18 and 19 year olds does not necessarily mean that you have to project a diminishing enrollment in your community college. But look at where the age distributions tell you you should begin pitching your curriculum, hiring your faculty, doing advertising and things of that sort. So you can modify those numbers to suit your advantage.

Social Characteristics of the Population in the 1980s

There's another thing about population that people don't usually want to talk about, but I think we ought to raise it. We already have in one way or another. The birthrate decline, as I said, is a white middle class phenomenon. The birthrate decline for the whole country is down 4 million to 3.2 million from 1960 to 1972. Of that, white births went from 3.6 million to 2.6 million. Minority births are steady, which means that a higher percentage of youth cohort is minority in background. The black 18 year old cohort goes from 12 to 18%. Most people who think about this kind of thing are now saying that by 1985 about 30% of the high school age cohort will be from minority group backgrounds. That's not distributed evenly by state either. If you look at Hispanics and look at the big growth there is, which are in the double checkmarks, you can see that it is primarily in the southwest. New York, however, and Florida both have significant increases in Hispanic populations, and you know that the Hispanics are now the largest minority group in the United States. The same data for blacks show the population tends to be oriented toward the southeast and is continuing to increase in terms of the migration back into some of those areas. So that suggests with minorities there is again a new opportunity for those institutions that really want to take those populations' educational needs seriously. Institutions in these states, particularly Texas and Florida, have both a significant increase in black populations and in Hispanics. That means if they want to, they can move into those areas and develop significant new programs.

Let's follow the differential fertility out into a state. I couldn't get data like this for Maryland, but Michigan, I suspect, is quite similar. The 12th grade enrollments for the state as you can see are a linear series. There is no year in which there's an increase in high school enrollments and high school graduations up until 1992. That's parallel with the national data we looked at already. Does that mean the State Board of Education should close half the schools and fire half the teachers? Not really, because if you look at where the declines have taken place, you find they're in areas like Dearborn, Dearborn Heights, Allen Park and Crestwood--white upper middle class suburbs. The declines in high school populations are just enormous--from 20 to 39% off. The lower middle class, but basically white suburbs of Detroit are going to be off 16 to 17%, but where will there be more high school students tomorrow than there are today? Central City Detroit is going to be up, not only in percentage but also in real numbers. There'll be more kids there to educate tomorrow than there are today. Question: What school of education is training teachers to teach in Detroit? Answer: Wayne State maybe. Nobody else. Most colleges are training teachers to teach in the glorious suburbs. The trouble is that there aren't going to be any kids there.

That then represents a problem called differential fertility. There are certain groups in the United States that haven't listened to most of the literature on family size. Mormons, for example, are becoming a hefty part of our population because they don't believe in that sort of thing. Seventh Day Adventist and other groups are significantly increasing their relative place in American life, simply because their family size has not decreased.

So, to sum up that part of the data, we really have three distinct periods in America. In 1965 we were a youth-oriented culture. The people who made money were the people who sold yo-yo's and frisbees and hula hoops, and we were reading books like the "Greening of America" which told all of us up here what this young generation was really going to be like and how afraid we were of them. I remember my father, who, of course, was raised long before the depression, made the crack to me when I was growing up that he had an unique opportunity. He was just old enough to be afraid of his own father and yet he was young enough to be afraid of his son. This, then, was a period of great youth dependency. By 1975 we had realized that that was a temporary glich and, indeed, the population of youth was declining. Here we have a problem. How are we going to provide goods and services for that huge group of people knowing it won't last? Do we build condominiums for them? Do we build discos for them? Do we get General Motors to build all kinds of fancy sports cars for them? Probably not. So here we became aware of the fact that this was not just the "greening of America"--maybe it's the balding of America because this group is going to get older. We can be quite sure of that and as they do, the strain on the resource base is going to be very large because they get larger fast but they get smaller also. By 1985, the best bet is that we'll have a population that will look something like a middle-age spread diagram. This group, of course, is getting older. It's like the mouse going through the snake--they'll just keep on getting older and we'll have to provide services for them in a way that's disproportioned. Now we know that behind them is going to be a diminished population. Knowing that, we can make some marvelously likely projections. Number one is that a voluntary army is going to be almost impossible to maintain. Number two, the Social Security system is going to be very interesting when this many young people retire and this many people are paying into the system. Number three, violent crime will probably be reduced because young people who can't get work, a fairly significant group, often commit crimes. You can also ask some questions about the labor force. What's McDonald's going to do? Now it appears that McDonald's might actually have to pay those people because General Motors is going to want them; AT&T is going to want them; Ford's going to want them and McDonald's will have to compete for a very small pool of youth labor. That will change the nature of the distribution considerably. So when we become that kind of country, it's going to be, I think, considerably different. It'll be a little more conservative. It'll be a little more concerned about overstraining resources to meet the need of one age group when we know that right behind it there's going to come another one that won't be quite so large.

Out of this demography we can also argue that the multiple earner family is going to be one of the most revolutionary ideas of the 1980s and right now they're becoming the dominant market for many particular kinds of products. The husband and wife combination with both earning $20,000 to $30,000 each gives you a family income of $50,000 to $65,000. In one study that was done of the graduates of the University of Oklahoma's Bachelor of Liberal Arts, they found that the average income level for that group in Oklahoma had not been reached when they put the maximum on the questionnaire up to $35,000 a year per person. Most people still wouldn't check 35; that is, it was more than 35 in terms of what their family was bringing in. That's Oklahoma. Add $15,000 and you've got something roughly like what you need in order to survive here. Now, multiple-earner families are interesting because of the strain they put on the tax base. They're not interested in public schools. They want the Louvre across the street, the Boston Symphony one block down, and a free public golf course just across the way with, of course, no green fees. And, because the multiple-earner family tends to be well educated, they understand political processes well enough to lobby for their objectives. If you look at a city like Tulsa, Oklahoma, or Long Beach, California, you find cities that are significantly different because of the political impact of multiple-earner families.

Trend number two that comes from the demography is working women. Fifty-three percent of women with school-age children are now in the work force, according to the statistical abstracts. That's an enormous change. Most Western nations have not been through that very same thing. It does suggest, however, that there's some interesting new community college markets when a woman enters the work force because all the studies I've seen indicate that when that happens the woman develops an enormous hunger for further education. Very few community colleges have geared programs specifically for the entry-level female who is entering a job or career for the first time.

Out of that will come some other trends. One is the increased number of states with continuing education requirements. In these states the totals here give you the idea of how many states are forcing those professions to go back to work and to go back to school in order to stay in the work place. That trend isn't finished yet. I suspect that by 1983 or so we will have an incredibly large number of people, probably 14 million in America, who will be forced because of continuing education legislation to go back to some form of school. However, the legislation doesn't say where they're to go. Community colleges normally assume, "Well, of course, they'll come to us." State university extension people say, "Well, of course, they'll come to us." The proprietaries are doing marketing surveys to see if they can't get advertising and make sure that they come to them. There is no agreement where those people are going to go but that's about a 14 million person market. We are responding to the continuing education needs of adults already. If you look at the non-credit registrations in America it's virtually doubled. If you look at where this is now taking place, the universities are still not in this market and probably won't be. Four-year institutions have seen it as a kind of a financial salvation, and I think they're doing some very silly things by getting into the field. Two-year colleges have exactly the right kind of program; it can be done at a high level of excellence and it works.

It's clear that one response to these new adult needs has been a marked increase in the number of non-credit registrations in continuing education. In addition, the number of institutions offering higher education in the United States is huge. This is the best kept secret in America, and that is that 46 million American adults today are being educated past high school by something other than a college or university. Let me say that again--46 million Americans today are being educated in the United States past high school by something other than a college or university. How many college students are there in the country? About 11,800,000. How many people are educated through extension, leaving out courses on languages on college campuses? 12 million Americans. Agricultural extension by itself educates more people than the college and university systems put together. We never think of this as a symphony orchestra to be conducted or organized, but it seems to me that community colleges are marvelous institutions to begin pulling that kind of resource together.

A final comment on where this has taken place. If you look at industry, it is clear that the Conference Board estimate was conservative in 1977 of $2 billion. In 1979, the Conference Board figure is $20 billion which American industry spent on its own educational system; that is not money to pay their employees to come to your college to take your courses. It is built in the industry by the industry's own education branch. If that sounds a little strange to you, look at AT&T. AT&T employs a million workers and invests $700 million on its educational program. The MIT budget for comparison purposes is $222 million. AT&T is three times as large as the Massachusetts Institute of Technology in terms of its educational program. Testimony that was given just last week in the House indicated that the total AT&T education budget this year is $1.2 billion. Of that money, almost none of it goes to colleges and universities. Almost all of it is in-house done by AT&T to serve its own purposes. The fact that an AT&T scientist won the Nobel Price last year probably should not go unnoticed.

So when we think of the new demography and the needs of adults, here are some of the people and some of the organizations that will be playing the game--the military, very good at teaching adults how to read and how to survive; industry;

the proprietary institutions; professional associations, which have over half of the continuing education students right now and not colleges and universities; museums, which are marvelously adapting sequencing instruction; and the health industry, which is a huge educational system all by itself. So those are the people who are going to be doing the education to deal with the new demography.

We know much about what people would like and this might be a help in your planning. Forty-one percent of American adults say they don't want to take a major, they don't want to take a degree; all they want is one course, let me in, let me take my course, and let me go home. And, of course, most places still insist on branding these people as failures because they say you didn't complete the program and the people never intended to complete the program. All they wanted was that one course. Who's going to let them just take the one course and leave?

A lot of them want an assessment of their personal competencies. Twenty-eight percent want strengths and weaknesses and their basic skills tested; twenty-two percent simply want to know what's going on in the region. Try finding out all the educational opportunities around the Washington, D.C. area. It's very, very difficult to know exactly what's available. One out of five American adults will say in a face to face interview that they feel the need for personal counseling. It doesn't mean psychiatry! It means that at sometime in the process of adult development, they would like some sophisticated help from an understanding, knowledgeable, and well-trained counselor.

We're beginning to see some of these new kinds of delivery services that are being put together for these new populations, and I think this has just begun to happen, but these are the places where adults congregate with time on their hands and nothing to read except a 1932 copy of the National Geographic. These are the places where you put those marvelous electronic games that are coming out that are just fascinating--what you can do with basic hand calculator models in vocational selection, for example. What are you good at? One of these little machines, if you bolted it to the table, will last for about three months. Adults who go through that process go to diagnostic centers where they have a chance to really check out what interests them and what opportunities are available, and then you can refer them to agencies where they can actually accomplish their objectives. That's one kind of model which is in use in California. In New England a regional examining institute has been created to provide for businesses' need to assess individuals' competence, whether they have the degree or not. In many jobs, it's still almost illegal to hire somebody simply because they possess a college degree. The person who has no college but wants credit for previous experience goes to the area examining institute and gets to the college, so this institution meets all of the examining needs of industry and higher education and does so in a neutral form. Regional is what any state government would kill instantly. That's one reason that it's being conceived of as an area-wide examining system. It's neutral, it's responsible to public opinion but not dominated by it, and it seems to me that probably in the next five years you'll see one of them.

So who is going to be able to handle this new kind of demography? It seems to me that this is pretty clear--institutions that can attract all ages. If you've got a 40 year old who is going to stay in this County until that person is 60, what kind of a curriculum can you develop that covers 20 years to get that person from here to there? They may want to take a course every two years. That might be a learning plan. It's a lot of money in the bank for you. So, how do we do that? Schedule for part-time students and not against them. Twenty adults in a registration line waiting to register for a course is not a neutral quantity. Many of those people are making $5 an hour and they're foregoing that in order to come and stand in your registration line. So you had better have a $5 an hour explanation of why they are there because that's how much they're giving up.

You have to have an urban base, although that doesn't have to be your only base of opportunity, but these days you've got to have some contact with the major city. You have to reduce dependence on tuition as your only source of income, and community colleges have an enormous advantage there. I hope you don't ever lose that because your independence is gained largely by a diversified set of income sources.

You have to operate at or near planned capacity; you must market for women and minorities, and that doesn't mean you put a sign that says, "Women Here." It means that the whole curriculum has got to be responsive to the needs of special groups that come to the institution for certain kinds of education.

You have to staff flexibly for instruction. Developing lifespan curriculum is what I was talking about just a minute ago. What does a 55 year old need in terms of English Literature? Or auto repair? Or whatever? We don't think much about those problems but it is a very significant thing. I had Macbeth, for example, when I was 18 and indeed the very form in which I had Macbeth is interesting. When I had Macbeth I didn't know anything about what was really going on in the world, but having been a dean and having run a federal agency for three years, give me a play about lust, murder, evil, political ambition, and I'm prepared to read it and discuss it. So at various age levels your reaction to certain kinds of curriculum may be very different.

You have to make use of local resources which community colleges are good at but you could get better at. How many distinguished practioners are there in your County who do an absolutely superb job on some one thing that might lure 50 people to your campus and then stay?

The non-instructional services that you'll have to provide for adults, including contracting, diagnosing, and advocating--those kinds of services can be charged;

that is, it is now legal in most states to charge those units even though they don't generate student credit hours.

Let me close with a metaphor. There are two ways of delivering food to people, the normal cafeteria way and the scrambled access way. Now, this looks sort of easy to most people but to a systems person the cafeteria line is a linear one-way bounded system. Think about it as a linear one-way bounded system and you come up with some very interesting consequences. Let's say a person gets to beverages and then decides that he didn't want those rutabagas that he picked up earlier. Try going back against the line to hand the rutabagas back; people have been killed literally in the act of doing that. Notice that the sequence of choice is the seller's and not the buyer's. In the scrambled access cafeteria the sequence of choice is the buyer's and not the seller's. The buyer can go anywhere he or she wants in order to maintain that kind of meal that he or she is trying to get. Scrambled access turns out to be 20% more efficient that the linear system; that is, you can get 20% more people through per hour. When this system was presented to college cafteria managers, however, they said of it, "It's immoral." When people asked why, they said, "Well, what you don't realize is that desserts are always put either at the end of a cafeteria line or on a separate table." Desserts for college cafeteria managers are spelled e-v-i-l. The trick is to force people to go by these things that are good for you so that you fill up your tray with the good stuff, then when you get to desserts they said, you only have room for one. John Calvin is alive and well in the United States and they said if you give people this much freedom they'll take nothing but desserts. Well, we counted trays for about four days and came back and said, "Hey, not true, they don't take any more desserts this way than they did that way." Answer: "What do facts have to do with it?" And, of course, I thought I was back in the faculty meeting again because it was just marvelous to see the way they reacted.

But then it occurred to me that we organize higher education in a very interesting way--freshman, sophomore, junior, senior. Take a term off and you've committed an illegal act. Either your girlfriend is pregnant or you're on drugs. It's not the right thing to do. Good students go right through; that's the way we want them to go. Instructor, assistant professor, associate professor, full professor. English 101, 201, 301, 401, and you can't get into 401 unless you have had 301 even if your instructors say you know the stuff. "Too bad, we have standards here." When I thought about that, it occurred to me that my parents had very linear lives. They went to school, then to work, and then they had a year when they could have a good time that was called leisure activity or retirement. Now we mix these up. Twelve year olds in school have work experience programs and we have enforced leisure for 40 year old workaholics so they won't kill themselves.

So our lives are moving away from the linear model toward something that's much different, leading to what I hope we can think about in the next few years, and that is a model of integrated community services. Each one of these community services has an educational component. The person to be served is in the middle of the organizational chart. The job for the next decade, because of the changing demography, is going to be to integrate and coordinate these various educational functions that are being performed by those various institutions, and who is better qualified to do that than the community college?

BLANK PAGE DO NOT FILM

BLANK PAGE DO NOT FILI

SOCIAL CHARACTERISTICS OF THE MONTGOMERY COUNTY POPULATION IN THE 1980s

Drew Dedrick, Chief of Special Projects,
Montgomery County Planning Board

Forecasting entails looking into the future with a background in social science, knowledge of economics, and knowledge of technological change. It involves taking assessment of what types of firms would likely locate in the County, where our young people would likely move, who will get married, when they will get married, when they will divorce, how many children they will have. So it involves knowledge from a great number of disciplines. Frankly, I'm not an expert in any one of those disciplines, and in fact, looking at this group of people before me, I wish in a way I could take all your brains and put it in my computer and help me to do forecasting, because forecasting is more an art than a science.

Let me start out by mentioning the basic things I want to discuss. I want to talk a little about the regional setting of Montgomery County. I want to talk second about Montgomery Community College. What do we mean by community college? "Community" to me as a planner means something, and maybe we can have dialogue to discuss concepts of the community. Thirdly, I want to talk about trends within the County.

The Washington Metropolitan Area is quite large. It has about 3.2 million people. The projections are for about 3.5 million people by 1990. It's one of the ten largest metropolitan areas in the country. It may be surprising, but of the ten largest areas in the country, only six are expected to grow in the next ten years, and of those six only two will more than likely grow faster than the Washington Area. They are Houston and Dallas-Fort Worth. So this area is probably a good place to be a college teacher because the metropolitan area will grow, and that's not going to be the same for Detroit or New York, and a number of other areas.

When we look at the region, we define it in terms of the urban core--the District of Columbia, Arlington, Alexandria, some of the urban settlements in the region, and then we have the suburban ring--Montgomery, Fairfax, Prince George's County, and any ex-urban area--Loudoun, Prince William, Charles, and Frederick. Of course, the District started growing first and Montgomery started growing really significantly in the 1930s and very much so in the 1960s. Prince George's County had its big growth in the 1960s; its population has actually declined in the past ten years. Fairfax County is a major growth area now in the region. One of the reasons is the Capital Beltway. Montgomery County has the smallest share of the Beltway, and I think you have read enough in the newspapers about suburban growth following the circumvential pattern of the interstate highway systems that circumvent the cores of most metropolitan areas. This Beltway is critical to development. We talk about our Metro system. Metro is important, but we're still primarily a car-oriented community as far as transportation, so there's more land in Fairfax County that's vacant that is near this Beltway. Right now, Montgomery County is, in terms of comparing with the other jurisdictions, the third largest jurisdiction. In 1990, we'll also be the third largest. What will happen is that we will then pass the District of Columbia in size. We're about 600,000 people now in the County; we'll be about 642,000 in 1990. Fairfax County will surpass us, but we'll surpass the District, so we'll be one of the top three which will then be Fairfax, Montgomery, and Prince George's County; that's if you believe the Prince George's County forecast. I guess if I had to make a forecast, I'd say that we'll surpass Prince George's County and we'll be the second largest jurisdiction in 1990.

Social Characteristics of the Montgomery County Population in the 1980s

This Metropolitan Area will continue to grow and Montgomery County will continue to grow. Montgomery County is an attractive, well-planned community, which will remain popular. We have an outstanding park system and a national reputation for being a nice place to live.

In terms of national growth, we're somewhat different from the Nation. The Nation will grow about 10% in the next ten years. Montgomery County will grow around approximately 10%. However, our population is somewhat younger than the Nation's population because we started growing significantly only in the last 20 years. If we take a look at the growth for the region as a whole, the highest amount of growth that is going to come in the next 10 years will be in the ex-urban area which includes Loudoun, Prince William County, Charles County, and Frederick County. This is a pattern that's consistent with what's happening nationally, as far as small cities growing faster than large cities, small metropolitan areas growing faster than large metropolitan areas, etc. The District will decline in growth; we'll be gaining moderately in growth percentage-wise but a lot in absolute amount, and ex-urban areas will be gaining mostly in the highest percentage but smallest in the absolute amount. Growth during the 1980s will be somewhat less at an annual average rate than growth in the 1970s, significantly less than growth in the 1960s. Montgomery County's employment growth will exceed in percentage terms its household growth. We're maturing and becoming a more balanced community. The District of Columbia, for example, has almost as much employment as it has households. We have the second largest employment base in the region. Right now, there are five jobs for every ten residents in Montgomery County. In 1990, there will be six jobs for every ten residents in Montgomery County.

If you take a look at comparison of population-employment growth, you see that in both of the past decades and the future decade we expect employment growth at a faster rate than population. One of the things I want to stress is that when you talk about the Montgomery County community, it includes more than simply the residential community. Approximately half of the daytime adult population under 65 in Montgomery County is employed here but doesn't live here.

Let's talk about regions of Montgomery County. There is Lower County, Middle County, Upper County. In terms of population growth, most of the population growth in Montgomery County will take place in the next 10 years in the Upper County region, half of it but most in terms of share, about 25,000 population as opposed to 11,000 in the Middle County region and 15,000 in the Lower County region. However, the pattern will look essentially the same because we're only talking about approximately a 10% increase in population. The pattern is going to be the same; the older, Lower County region will have the bulk of the population; the Middle County region will have the second largest concentration; and, of course, the Upper County, the smallest. Most of the growth will take place in the Upper County region. This will be despite any kind of energy crisis. I believe we have an energy crisis, but I don't think you'll see large numbers of people moving closer in because this area is largely developed. There aren't that many vacant parcels; also, the Lower County communities are concerned about what type of densities are in their neighborhoods. They're not looking to have high-rise buildings in their neighborhood just because they may have the only vacant lot within two square miles of Metro. So, in order for more people to live in this area, you actually need more land in this area and that's impossible. I think people are going to have to get more economical automobiles.

Total employment growth is essentially the same pattern, the largest concentration is Down County. At least, however, as time goes by, new employment growth in the Up County area will exceed that in the Down County since the

Down County area will be largely built up in the next 10 years as far as land planned for commercial/industrial uses. Also there's only limited capacity in the Middle region which is basically a controlled suburban sprawl area.

Let's talk about numbers, statistics, demographics. Here's mine for Montgomery County. In terms of ages 15 to 19, we're going to lose about 8% in that age cohort; nationally, about a 15% decline, so again there's reason to be somewhat optimistic. We're not quite as bad as the national experience. That's our low forecast.

Approximately 25% to 30% of Montgomery County residents work for federal or local government with good retirement programs. Some of the people move south, but many stay here. With life-expectancy increasing, people will be wanting additional education. As time goes on, this type of education is going to become more and more significant, and I think there will be an after shock created by the post World War II baby boom which you should consider in your planning.

SOCIAL CHARACTERISTICS OF THE MONTGOMERY COLLEGE STUDENT BODY IN THE 1980s

David Armstrong, Research Analyst, Office of Institutional Research,
Montgomery College

You are well aware of some of the trends which have characterized and will continue to characterize population growth both nationally and in Montgomery County. One way for us to think about these trends is to consider what impact they are likely to have upon the composition of the College's enrollment during the 1980s.

Montgomery College has recently adopted an enrollment projection process which results in three enrollment projection series which have been labelled "Base," "Medium" and "High." (Figure I). The current official projection for the College during the first half of the 1980s is represented by the "Medium" series on the graph. Note that the dots on the graph represent actual enrollment levels and the solid line beyond 1979 represents the official enrollment projection. We expect that enrollment will continue to increase throughout the 1980s. In order to derive these projections, the College uses several techniques, the most important of which is a method which applies estimates of student yield to county-wide projections of the population components from which the College's students are drawn. Forecasts for these county population components come principally from two sources: first, the public school forecasts for 12th grade enrollments and second, the County Planning Board forecasts for County residents in various age groups. The previous speaker has described how the age structure of the Montgomery County population is likely to change during the next few years. At least two major trends in County population are likely to change during the next few years. At least two major trends in County population will significantly affect the College. First, the number of high school graduates will be declining throughout the 1980s. Second, the population as a whole will be aging rapidly even as it increases in number. It is possible to apply these expected population changes to the official College projections and ask what the age structure of the Montgomery College student body will be if the College projections are fulfilled.

The next graph (Figure II) shows how the age structure of the College student body has changed since 1974 and how it will continue to change through 1989. I should mention that the age groups used here span unequal numbers of years, so that 1974 gives us a nice "pyramid" shape. These particular age groups are of significance to the College, as the 17-19 group represents recent high school graduates. The other groups correspond to divisions employed by the County Planning Board. Note also that the projections shown on the slide continue to 1989, beyond the range contained in the official College projections. This 1989 projection is presented less distinctly than the 1984 projection, suggesting, perhaps, my confidence in a ten-year projection. By 1989, the "pyramid" has been squeezed upward into a "sparkplug" shape. There will be shrinkage in the 17-19 and 20-24 year old age groups, especially in the 17-19 group. This shrinkage will occur not only in the proportional representation of people of these ages but also in their absolute numbers. The number of Montgomery College students below the age of 25 will decrease by 15% between 1979 and 1989. The proportion of Montgomery College students below the age of 25 will shrink from approximately two-thirds in 1974 to less than one-half in 1989. During the same period of time, the median age of students will climb from 21 to 26 years.

There are several other major trends which we can expect in the composition of the student body during the decade of the 1980s. First, there will be a greater proportion of women among the College's students. That is shown on the next graph (Figure III). Much publicity has been given to the "returning" woman, the older woman who has had a family and is now returning to complete her education. We expect this trend to continue, at least during the early part of the 1980s. By 1984, 60% of the College's students will be women, while in 1970 they made up only 40% of the student body. Note that the bars on the graph represent proportions and not absolute numbers. The number of male students at the College has not declined, rather the proportion of the College's enrollment made up by men has decreased, due to the tremendous influx of "returning" women during the 1970s. These additional students will be women over the age of 25 and a large proportion of them will be employed. Currently, about half of all Montgomery College students are employed full-time and about 20% are employed part-time. We can anticipate that these proportions of employed students will increase substantially during the 1980s.

These changes in student characteristics will cause a continuation of the trend toward a greater proportion of part-time students in the College's student body. The next graph (Figure IV) illustrates the increase in the proportion of part-time students. This latter trend has resulted from the increasing number of students who have responsibilities at work or in the home which force them to attend on a part-time basis. Since the provision of educational opportunities for adult students is a part of the College's State mandated mission, we anticipate that the College's continuing education function will increase as well. The Carnegie Council has also recognized the growing importance of continuing education as a function of Higher Education.

The College's primary source of full-time students has been recent graduates of the County's high schools, and as I have pointed out, this group will be declining in number throughout the 1980s. The average number of credit hours carried by students has declined steadily in recent years and can be expected to continue to do so into the 1980s, but at a slower rate. Nevertheless we expect that the total number of credit hours taken at the College will continue to increase gradually during the 1980s. However, the College will have to enroll a greater and greater number of students in order to accomplish this. This trend will place an increasing administrative and financial burden upon the College. Unfortunately, the College's revenues are determined largely by the total number of credit hours that are taken and not by the total number of students served. It is a truism that regardless of the number of credit hours he or she takes, each student requires a fixed amount of administrative cost in order to register, to use the library and to use a host of other student services. As the number of part-time students increases, these per student costs increase as well, but the revenues available from tuition and state aid to the College do not multiply as fast. Thus, the increasing number of part-time students who will enroll during the 1980s will place a large administrative and financial burden on the College during the coming decade. We will need to ask whether we can design more creative responses to these burdens, and we will need to ask if there is a better formula by which the State can fund the College.

The trends I have described have clear implications for planning at Montgomery College during the 1980s. It is likely that there will be greater demand for classes in the evenings and on weekends. It is likely that the number of students in transfer programs will continue to decline unless we can encourage larger numbers of adult students to enroll in them. Several questions arise at this point. The trends which I have described are likely to occur to a greater or lesser degree depending upon the actions which the College takes. We need to ask if there are ways through which we can encourage a greater proportion of the County's high school graduates to enroll at the College. Montgomery College currently enrolls about 19% of the County's high school graduates during the fall semester after their graduation. In order for the College to enroll the same number of these graduates in 1984 as it enrolled in 1979, it would have to increase its yield rate from 19% to 23%. We also need to ask if there are ways in which we can increase enrollment in liberal arts programs, and we need to ask if there are more ways in which we can cooperate with business and industry in order to serve more fully the training needs of that sector. None of these considerations is entirely new to you. However, this conference provides us with the opportunity to recognize that there are some aspects of the future about which we can be fairly certain and to consider actions which will prepare us for those certainties.

GOVERNMENTAL FACTORS

THE ROLE OF GOVERNMENT IN HIGHER EDUCATION

Edward Gruson, Senior Staff Member, Sloan Commission
on Government and Higher Education

A new drama has been playing on the college campus of the 1970s. While it may not have made many headlines, it has distracted the faculty offstage and kept a large audience absorbed. A growing number of lawyers and administrators are in the cast needed by colleges and universities to deal with a growing number of federal agents and investigators. Their dialogue of the deaf about affirmative action and financial accountability leads to little more than bad feeling on all sides. The struggle centers on how much right the government has to tell higher education what to do.

The academic world is traditionally autonomous. Its history offers considerable justification for its proud belief that it is able to change with the times. Over the past decade the government steadily increased its output of laws and regulations affecting the campus, and moved aggressively in many places to get the compliance with them that it must have. This, basically, is what spawns the tension.

It comes at a time when American higher education is suffering the pangs of entering a new age, one of uncertainty and growing pessimism. A time of unprecedented expansion, change and buoyancy has ended, and now it faces a time of retrenchment. The growth came from the explosion of the college age population after World War II and from all the other changes that produced a rising percentage who chose college over going to work following high school. But college going shows clear signs of a significant downturn that will continue for at least the next fifteen years because of striking demographic shifts. Although many students today are not in the traditional age group, the Commission is confident that their numbers will not begin to make up for the loss of those who are.

This declining demand for higher education coincides with a period of severe financial stress when inflation is driving up operating costs dramatically and hitting hard at all of its sources of income.

Government was a powerful and generous ally during the expansion. It could not have been otherwise since it understood well how our colleges and universities could fill the extraordinary demands for education and research that existed. Its nose barely poked on to the campus. But today, there is less understanding, and it sometimes seems that the entire camel is bumping and thumping around inside the higher education tent.

The conflict has persisted for some years and our Commission was created to examine the reasons for it. We are convinced that although there are real problems that will not go away, much can be done to improve the ways in which the government and colleges and universities get along; this was our limited objective. We did not set out to present a vision of the ideal structure and call for drastic change. Still, some of our proposals are bold and suggest a new order of priorities. Not everyone, on or off the campus, will like what we have to say. Without opposition, we would be left in doubt that it was worth saying at all.

Although our report is detailed and its recommendations are highly specific, we mean it for the concerned citizen as well as the expert. Some of what we recommend is addressed to colleges and universities. Some of what we recommend needs action in state legislatures, in government agencies and in Congress. All of what we recommend deserves wide public discussion. Every American is involved--as parent, as student, or as taxpayer.

Government in Higher Education

Higher education is now a big business. It involves many people and much money. There are 11 million students in our colleges and universities which employ one million faculty, administration and staff. Total revenues are currently about $45 billion each year: $11 to $12 billion comes from students and their families, and $3 billion from gifts, non-government grants and contracts, and endowment income. All the rest is provided by governments.

Large sums of public money are involved. In the fiscal year 1979-80, state legislatures invested $19 billion, and the federal government spent $14 billion, most of which went directly or indirectly to institutions.

These figures point up the importance of higher education to each of us as taxpayers. If it is to survive in something resembling its present form, public funds of this magnitude will be needed for as far ahead as we can see. Each of us has a large stake in making sure that the money is well used.

There are no easy answers to the questions we had to consider. Many are deeply philosophical ones which divide the public and involve a conflict between two conceptions of fairness in how American society distributes opportunities and rewards. One view emphasizes individual effort and would reserve rewards for those who earn them. The other view stresses our obligations to meet the needs and claims of disadvantaged groups. As we, ourselves, examined the concrete problems of public policy in higher education, we tried to arrive at a proper balance between these two philosophies.

The Commission's recommendations are shaped by these broad convictions:

- It is of first importance to preserve the diversity of higher education. The response to new conditions, here as elsewhere, should be directed by the pluralistic choices of students and their parents, rather than by centralized decision-making.

- The social goals of equal opportunity legislation must be maintained, but a better way to reach them is needed. The initiative and responsibility must be kept primarily with the colleges and universities.
- Retrenchment is a new and difficult task. Reduction of capacity must be managed in a way that maintains quality and variety. The whole burden should not fall on private institutions.
- Federal financial aid should continue to have the primary aim of helping students, so that no high school graduate who wants further education is limited by financial need. Yet, self-help should also be an element in every aid program. Another appropriate federal role is enabling students to have wider choices among institutions by making the borrowing power of the federal government available to all students and their families.
- Present mechanisms of federal support for research and scholarship at colleges and universities are fundamentally sound. Steadier funding, and some long-run growth in real terms are, however, needed in order to maintain America's preeminence in science and scholarship.
- The heavy involvement of the federal government in medical education, and the tendency towards manpower planning and direction point to future dangers for higher education as a whole.

We call on our Congressmen, on our state legislators, on our government officials and on our political leaders to recognize that there has been an alarming loss of perspective on what higher education is all about, what it can do and must do, and what it should not be asked to do. More and more, the government is raising questions about faculty appointments and promotions through agents who simply do not know enough about higher education. More and more, problems are in the hands of administrators and legal advisors but not in the hands of faculties, where real decisions are made. More and more, student admissions policies are under attack, and present procedures encourage this to be done in the courts. More and more, the government is expressing views on curriculum. More and more, scientists and scholars working with federal grants feel they are being treated like suppliers of office equipment or builders of dams. More and more, decisions on who shall teach, what they shall teach, and whom they shall teach are passing from colleges and universities to government agencies and the courts.

What we are saying is that present procedures--causing increasing bitterness and pessimism on both sides--ignore the vital interests of higher education. All too often, the standards are incomprehensible and inconsistent. Most of the procedures evolved in other contexts--secondary school or business. Many of the mechanisms used now are clumsy, duplicative, insensitive, time-consuming, ineffective and expensive. The remedies we recommend are ones we believe to be fair to all the complex values at stake. If accepted, we think they will make a difference for the coming generation.

We call on the colleges and universities to recognize that some governmental oversight is inevitable. While we deplore the present lack of perspective on the part of the government, we also emphasize that it is unreasonable and unfair for higher education to accept billions in public money annually without being ready to account for its use, and without meeting the social goals towards which so much of the resented governmental oversight is directed. What is needed now is simple acceptance of some of government's demands as minimal and proper, though onerous and sometimes expensive.

Our recommendations for improvement call for much self-regulation, and more is needed. We urge our colleges and universities to take a new hard look at themselves. Academics frequently have been pioneers in calling for change in other social institutions, but have not always been ahead of society in changing their own. Many of the current demands resented by academic spokesmen are neither extraordinary nor illegitimate. The academy claims special status as the disinterested custodian of truth. But some of the advertising of "academic" institutions is as extravagant as any in the commercial sector.

Both sides must work to restore the good will and feeling of partnership that the government and higher education enjoyed for so long. The prevailing adversarial mood is dangerous, and particularly in this coming period when the dependence on the government as a patron will be so great in our colleges and universities. They must educate the regulators, anticipate problems, and most of all, must themselves make the changes that are needed. The institutions are in the best position to decide how to change and keep their capacity to do what society needs them to do.

The pluralism of America is reflected in the forms and purposes assumed by colleges and universities, particularly in the last generation. Their immense diversity embodies to a remarkable degree the values of our society. It could be a casualty of the present conflict with government and of the coming retrenchment. It is unique to this country and one of our greatest strengths. Ours is the only country in the world that makes it possible for all high school graduates to find the kind of further education that suits their talents and desires. We affirm the great value to the individual, and to our society, of a rich menu of choice. Present trends could well end in the substitution of a table d'hôte for an à la carte offering.

Some of our colleges and universities are predominantly Catholic, some Baptist, some Jewish. Some serve only women. Some serve small local communities; some draw students from all sections of the nation and from abroad. Some are public and almost tuition free, while some are private, with high tuitions. Some have great endowments and depend heavily on the generosity of their graduates. After the second World War, much of the new enrollment was in new wide-access public institutions. There has been a phenomenal increase in the numbers of two-year community colleges, most of which offer vocational training as well as the traditional liberal arts, as well as in new four-year comprehensive colleges.

Not every college of every type can survive, or should survive, the coming enrollment decline and competition for students. But we can be sure that every college of every type will fight hard to keep open. The pressures on the public and the legislatures for support will be formidable. Anticipating this, we were led to think hard about how to guard quality. What the states do in the next fifteen years will have a profound influence on both the quality and variety of higher education.

We want to emphasize that we see great risks of federal intervention in the retrenchment process. Our Commission concluded that it is best for the federal government to resist pressures to shape its financial aid or other policies so that they bolster an otherwise declining demand.

Most students in college today are in institutions that are not nationally known. We think this is a fact which is not widely appreciated, and that is why we stress it. If too many institutions of a particular type are forced to close their doors in a particular locale, it would be a great loss not only to the students who would have elected to go to them, but to our society. Homogenization of viewpoint and form is a threat to the deepest values in our unique democracy. Public support must continue to be distributed broadly. We offer recommendations that we believe will accomplish this while encouraging the survival of the fittest.

We asked the following questions, and answered yes to all of them:

- Is it important to keep successful comprehensive and community colleges alive? Yes, because they are a major new channel of social mobility.
- Is it important to continue to have a significant number of small private liberal arts colleges? Yes, because they preserve our intellectual inheritance and provide a sanctuary for moral and social criticism.
- Is it important to keep our great research universities, both public and private, strong? Yes, because they make our world leadership in science and technology possible by maintaining and enlarging our knowledge through scholarship, research and teaching.
- Is it important to keep supporting some colleges which are predominantly for blacks, or for Hispanic-Americans, or for women? Yes, because historically, these institutions have been the seedbed where people with talents for leadership were first awakened to their possibilities.

Of course, no one type of institution serves only one purpose, nor has every type of institution been mentioned. But all types share the job of educating and training our young men and women. We believe that only if we continue to encourage a mix as varied as the present one will higher education continue to do effectively all these tasks so vital to our country's well-being.

Our full report has many recommendations, described and analyzed in detail. In the following summary, we include only the major ones and of those, we single out two as particularly important: the creation of a single enforcement agency for equal opportunity laws and regulations in higher education; and reform of the federal financial aid program to insure that grants are reserved for poor students, while loans are used to widen choice of institutions by students and families of all incomes.

At first glance, these, and some of our other recommendations as well, appear to add to bureaucracy. Our purpose is just the opposite. We believe that the consolidations we recommend will bring sprawling and conflicting procedures together so that higher education and government can get along more amicably and more effectively.

At the outset, we decided that our report would be incomplete if it focused on federal regulation alone, although the academic reaction to its growth was the immediate stimulus for the creation of the Commission. Therefore, we covered all the major areas in which federal policies are important to higher education. In addition to regulation, these are financial aid to students, support for academic research, and medical education. Our discussions were organized around these topics and the full report contains chapters on each. We deal with all colleges and universities as part of one system, as does federal policy.

It was also clear that we could not make detailed recommendations for each of the fifty states. On the other hand, there are a few important questions which must be faced by most states, and we have a chapter on their role.

The context in which the wide expression of protest at governmental intrusiveness must be heard is presented at the beginning of the full report: the structure of higher education is described, as well as the involvement of the states and federal government in all parts of it. There is also an analysis of the economic situation of colleges and universities today and why their financial outlook is gloomy.

* * * * *

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Federal Regulation

Enforcement of laws on non-discrimination and equal opportunity create many difficult problems for colleges and universities, where the impact is peculiarly important. Most of the academic community accepts, by now, the broad substantive aims of these laws, or, at least, the obligation to comply with them. Moreover, since our colleges and universities have an actual, as well as symbolic, role as a major channel for social mobility, the need for effective application in higher education is clear and compelling. The Commission reaffirms the goals.

But difficult questions remain. What constitutes discrimination? Who should decide when it exists? On the basis of what standards? What should be done if it does exist? Who decides that? These are the questions the Commission addressed when looking at the problem. We concluded that the current machinery is not producing the answers that are needed, and is unlikely to do so without modification.

We have already described the vital interests of higher education in decisions on faculty, students and curriculum. In the coming decades, enforcement is likely to present even greater problems because of its poor growth prospects. There will be intense competition for academic jobs, so that both hiring and promotion of faculty will be under constant challenge for discriminatory practices. Institutions will increasingly compete for students as a result of declining enrollments and one road to survival is to lower academic standards. Issues involving fairness of student admission, student retention, and graduation will continue.

There are now seventeen federal laws and executive orders relating to equal opportunity to be enforced. There are eight different agencies, with many regional offices, responsible for enforcement. The federal courts, of course, have ultimate jurisdiction. This diffusion of responsibility, and proliferation, is one major source of confusion. Another is that Congressional legislation never spelled out clear standards or powers for any of these agencies. Compliance standards and enforcement procedures vary among them, and even within them, as officials are replaced or succeeded. Also, there is considerable duplication of effort on all sides, making the process expensive for both government and higher education. Field representatives are typically young, relatively low paid, with little experience or knowledge of colleges and universities. There is high turnover.

In addition, many aggrieved individuals and groups have come to feel that the agencies are not protecting their rights adequately and turn to the courts. The judicial, rather than the administrative mode, in fact, is now the prevailing one for enforcement of equal opportunity statutes. The courts have become the principal forum for hearing complaints, and now shape the substantive content of equal opportunity policy.

The Commission views the reliance on litigation as counter-productive since it reinforces adversary relations. It is also expensive and time-consuming. While it has produced some results that might not otherwise have been realized, the question must be asked whether they justify the time, money and effort involved not only for higher education and the government, but even for those it seeks to protect.

On the whole, financial incentives, widely discussed today as a more effective way to achieve the goals of any regulation, and one to be preferred to commands, are not easy to apply to equal opportunity enforcement. However, the

Commission has two recommendations that do use such incentives in addressing two specific problems. Both involve federal matching funds for institutional investment. First, we recommend that when colleges and universities have to make large investments in order to provide better facilities for the handicapped, the federal government should match the expenditure. Secondly, a small federal fellowship program now exists for black graduate and professional students. Since colleges and universities often find themselves with too small a pool of qualified candidates for black faculty appointments, it is in their own interest to enlarge the supply. We recommend that the federal program be modified so that it matches commitments from the institutions.

But a basic reform of procedures is needed over the whole range of problems in achieving equal opportunity in higher education. The present one, as we have seen, gets people into court too much and too soon. It interferes with many of the functions that make for good teaching and academic excellence. Useful results can be produced at more bearable costs.

We set about designing a procedure that puts more of the responsibility on the institutions for doing the job themselves. In particular, we focus on the proposition that academic institutions are collegial and not hierarchical. If affirmative action is to have lasting impact on our colleges and universities, it must be managed by the people who make the decisions. In these institutions, all of the really important decisions must involve faculty as well as administration. We looked for a procedure, then, to get the faculties seriously involved. More than good intentions on their part is essential; sanctions and controls must be retained. But, above all, the institution must check on its progress through criticism by its own community--the faculty.

Accordingly, we recommend the creation of a single consolidated agency for the enforcement of all equal opportunity laws in higher education, which we call the Council for Equal Opportunity in Higher Education. It would be an independent regulatory agency within the new Department of Education under the Secretary. It would provide incentives for effective self-regulation and, as much as possible, unify standards and consolidate enforcement.

The key feature of the new Council's procedures would be an assessment report required of every college and university, filed with the Council on a regular basis, and published. Each institution would develop its assessment procedures in a way that realistically reflects its own structure and decision processes. At present, affirmative action plans are typically produced by the central administration. A collegial process that involves those responsible in detail for decisions on students and faculty would encourage genuine change and probe its limits. Publication of the report is very important as a further prod toward institutional initiative. Suggested procedures for the regulatory agency's handling of the reports are spelled out in the body of our full document.

All complaints would be initially investigated by the Council which would be responsible for their resolution. The Council would have the power to issue rules and regulations, and to provide policy guidance on issues that bear on compliance problems, such as confidentiality and privacy. It would have the power to impose sanctions, including cease-and-desist orders, provision of back-pay or salary equalization, ordering "targeted" fund terminations limited to offending programs, departments or schools. It would also have the ultimate power to order termination of all federal funds to the whole institution. This threat, as now used, is a hollow one.

The Council should rely heavily on mediation and other informal, non-adversarial techniques, especially in cases initiated by individuals. The services of the regional offices of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, as well as those of private groups, such as the higher education associations themselves, could be drawn on for this purpose. Only if all these efforts failed, would the Council proceed to formal hearings.

The Council should be required to meet a procedural timetable. So long as it keeps within that calendar, only the Council's final orders could be appealed to the courts. On the other hand, if the Council fails to act in the required time, the parties would be entitled to take it to court.

Creation of the new Council we recommend requires new legislation. We recognize the difficulty of securing it, and the important obstacles to be overcome. Protected groups--such as women, ethnic minorities including blacks, the handicapped--must be persuaded, as we are, that the new procedures will be more effective in representing their interests, and so are a gain for them. Also, our recommendation may be dismissed by many as just adding another intrusive bureaucracy. Actually, the structure we propose would replace many other, and far more complex, ones that have little real power. We believe that a special agency is justified because present procedures are ineffective and enforcement problems are particularly delicate. It could also serve as a model for other areas of American life with similar problems.

Any change leading to more effective enforcement will, in itself, be a considerable step toward realizing the goals of the equal opportunity laws because it would diminish the adversarial attitudes that now dominate the relations between regulators and regulated. In the final analysis, the academic community itself must act. Until it accepts this obligation, more government intervention, not less, will result, and the threat to academic integrity and independence will increase.

There are two other main types of federal regulation about which many in higher education complain.

First, are all the laws relating to social security, workmen's compensation, occupational health and the like, many of which were only recently extended to colleges and universities. They add costs, and this impact is magnified by higher education's current financial problems. Small private institutions are particularly burdened, often needing to add administrative staff, while large ones, with their high visibility, are scrutinized regularly and thoroughly. Appropriations for public institutions, on the other hand, typically take these additional costs into account. Although some of the academic community asks for exemption from these measures, the Commission concluded that they are here to stay for all society, in substance if not in detail, and that it is neither fair nor realistic for higher education to expect special treatment.

The second major set of federal regulations involves financial accountability and comes primarily with the programs for student aid and research support. Accountability for public money is inescapable. However, the present auditing processes for research grants do have enough substantive impact for the Commission to propose their modification in our section on research support.

All of these regulations, as well as others, are discussed more fully in the complete report. While the Commission does not mean to minimize any problems which regulation creates, we believe we accurately reflect the assessment of the academic world that it is the requirements of non-discrimination and affirmative action which confront higher education with the most painful problems.

2. Role of the States

Today, the great majority of all students are in colleges financed and governed by the states, which contribute more to the total higher education budget than either the federal government or students and their families.

Government in Higher Education

The share of total state budgets devoted to higher education has levelled off, and in a number of states, begun to decline. With falling college enrollments, and competing demands for state services increasing, public higher education will find it difficult to get the appropriations it seeks. The decisions the states must make in the impending period of retrenchment will be crucial to the quality and variety of higher education offered.

The appropriations formulas now used by most states pay a substantial premium for each additional student enrolled. They effectively promoted expansion during the enrollment boom. As enrollments go down, these same formulas pose a double threat to academic quality. They erode the financial base of public institutions because funds needed to maintain the quality of academic programs are not granted, and also increase the incentive for institutions to compete for students by lowering academic standards.

Even though many public institutions may be operating below capacity and the standards of quality at some may decline sharply in order to attract students, few will close on their own volition. Indeed, since the Great Depression, only one state-supported four-year public college or university has been closed. Private institutions must attract a relatively full complement of tuition-paying students to remain solvent. Public institutions can stay open as long as legislatures supply the minimum appropriations needed. Since most public institutions have strong constituencies within their states, legislatures will reduce capacity only reluctantly, prolonging the pressures on enrollments and finances for all.

If the states use their financial resources to maintain the capacity of the public sector at present levels despite the decline in demand, the burden of contraction will fall disproportionately on private colleges and universities. Therefore, a disproportionate contraction of the private sector increases the cost to the taxpaying public of providing higher education to state residents. It also weakens the variety of institutions in a state. There is a clear interest, then, for each state to see that the burden of contraction is shared fairly by the public and private sectors.

As a matter of social philosophy, we believe that the necessary adjustments to declining enrollments are best made by the institutions themselves, public or private, rather than imposed by state governments not always attuned to, or sophisticated in, educational matters. That, after all, is the prime responsibility of the institutions' administrations and trustees. Yet the incentives built into the present system, the limitations of the market as an instrument of discipline for publicly-funded institutions, and the consequent one-sidedness of the public-private competition, all demand some more self-conscious, systematic and widely applied process of quality control than now exists.

Higher education boards now vary widely among the states in their degree of influence. The decisions the boards face in the years ahead must be made with a recognition of their importance by people who fully understand the purposes and problems of higher education. We believe that the best way to strengthen the boards is by strengthening their composition, not their powers. Members must command such respect that it should be impossible for political figures to ignore their recommendations without drawing considerable public criticism. The Commission recommends that most of the board should be lay members. No more than one-third should be representatives from higher education, but it is important for the voice of the private sector to be included.

The Commission recommends that each state arrange for a periodic review of the quality of educational programs at every public college and university within the state. The review should be conducted by academic peer groups, not by state employees. To the greatest extent possible, existing accrediting mechanisms, such as the regional and professional accrediting associations, should conduct the reviews.

Any governmental effort, whether state or federal, to evaluate the quality of education arouses profound uneasiness throughout the higher education community. It is seen as a threat to institutional autonomy and academic freedom. In our judgment, the impending enrollment decline justifies so radical a step. Candid evaluations of program quality, made by competent and disinterested reviewers, will be particularly valuable during a period of retrenchment. They can both provide warnings to the administrators in a particular institution and help institutions as a group to resist the temptation to compete for students by lowering academic standards. Further, independent judgments of program quality should be an important consideration when a state agency redefines the mission of an institution and changes its role, or even recommends closing it.

Publication of the reports is an essential part of the process. Only broad dissemination of the results of academic program reviews is likely to create a climate of opinion that will support change. Without publication, the institutions and other responsible sectors would find it too easy to suppress or ignore unfavorable reports. The reports should be made public after a one-year delay to allow time to act on recommendations.

Should private colleges and universities be included in the review process? On balance, inclusion of the private as well as public sector is probably desirable. With coordination between the two, it is more likely that wasteful duplication of programs can be avoided, and that contraction of capacity will proceed as equitably as possible. All would benefit if the voice of private higher education were made a deliberate part of the statewide coordinating and planning process, as is now the case in nine states. But, because the private institutions will look at the review process as an undesirable intrusion into their autonomy and may see it as a first step on the slippery slope to public control, we believe states should invite, but not require them to participate.

The Commission believes that the new retrenchment situation requires an adaptation of the basic appropriations formulas now used. The states could, for example, alter their formulas to combine a flat basic grant that covers a substantial part--perhaps one-third--of each institution's overall budget at current enrollment levels, with a per-student allowance that provides the remainder. This would reduce somewhat the incentive to compete for students by lowering standards. Also, by putting a clear price--the amount of the flat base grant--on keeping an institution open, a formula of this type would focus legislators' attention on the costs of failing to reduce capacity. Searching questions on possible mergers of institutions, changes in scope, and the like would be inescapable.

No change in an appropriations formula can itself resolve the underlying problems of declining demand. Public authorities must face their responsibility for adapting capacity to demand in a way which perceives quality and recognizes the risks of forcing the whole burden of adjustment on the private institutions.

The problem of maintaining quality has another side, the maintenance of those minimum standards that entitle an institution to call itself a college or university. Competition for students appears to have engendered an increase in questionable recruiting practices. A few colleges and universities have gone beyond aggressive recruiting techniques and begun to engage in practices which seriously detract from the educational quality of their programs. Instances of extramural curricular programs close to fraudulent are not unknown. These practices will probably become more widespread as enrollment declines and competition for students becomes fiercer. Each state should empower its higher education agency to license all institutions for operation within the state, and should establish and enforce minimum standards of academic conduct as a condition of licensing, in order to prevent fraudulent and deceptive practices. No institution of higher education should be exempt.

THE ROLE OF GOVERNMENT IN HIGHER EDUCATION

Lawrence Gladieux, Director of the College Board and
Co-Author of Congress and the Colleges

A lawyer who deals in the increasingly complex and contentious world of federal administrative law and agency rule making told me about the three most disingenuous statements in the world. The first is, "But, of course, I'll respect you in the morning." The second is, "The check is in the mail." The third is, "Hi, I'm from the federal government and I'm here to help you." Some folks might substitute state for federal government in telling that.

There is more than a touch of cynicism in the way we think about government today, its role in society, its role in higher education in particular. In recent years we have heard a crescendo of protest from higher education's leaders about federal intrusions. I doubt that a college or university president in the country has failed to rail against the burdens and the costs and the fundamental threat to academic life posed by government rules and regulations.

In a sense, all of this is not new. Controls of varying degree and kind have always followed the flow of dollars to the campuses, and there have been complaints right along. Representative John Brademas of Indiana, a leader in the House of Representatives on education legislation for years, used to say that complaints of educators about federal aid reminded him of the kid who went to summer camp and wrote back to his parents, "The food is terrible and besides the portions are too small." Even in the golden years of the 1960s when federal funds were burgeoning there were tensions in the "partnership" between Washington and the nation's colleges and universities. Tensions are inherent in my view, given on one hand the traditions of academic autonomy and on the other the mandates of social legislation, the missions of federal agencies, and the responsibility of those agencies for the stewardship of public funds.

While in a fundamental way nothing is new, attitudes and expectations of higher education with respect to the federal government have shifted in recent years. Let me offer a perspective on what has happened over the past decade. In 1971 and 1972, the national higher education associations joined in a united front and asked the federal government for a formula-based, enrollment-driven, across-the-board program of support for higher education--so-called institutional aid. There were long debates in Congress, and it was a close call. At stake was a fundamental question of who is responsible for financing higher education in this country. The outcome reaffirmed the traditional distinction between federal and state roles, with the states providing the basic support to maintain higher education institutions and the national government supplementing to meet particular national objectives. Instead of institutional aid, Congress opted for aid to students, putting the emphasis in national policy on equalizing opportunity for individuals.

As we move into the 1980s, an era of enrollment decline, I see no signs that higher education is rekindling hopes of rescue by the federal government. Academic institutions seem more concerned about protection from potential harm at the hands of government. Harold Enarson, president of Ohio State, several years ago noted a kind of mutual exhaustion between higher education and government--not surprising, he said, after a decade of upheaval and rapid change. So we are in a more cautious frame of mind these days about the role of government.

Let us do three things: identify major areas where I do not believe the federal government will or should intervene in the 1980s, but, instead, will and should leave matters to the states; second, offer a viewpoint on the dilemma of regulatory intrusions by the federal government; and third, draw attention to the area of the federal government's involvement with higher education that is likely to be of greatest importance in the 1980s for Montgomery College and most other institutions--financial aid to students.

On the first point, I think the big decisions in the period ahead are going to be made by the states. The landscape of postsecondary education, the division of labor among types of institutions, the probable adjustments that will need to be made to deal with excess capacity in the higher education system, the assurance of educational quality: all of these fundamental matters will be decided within the states and, in some perhaps substantial measure, by state authorities. A great deal of activity is currently under way in the states, including Maryland, to plan for the 1980s. Master plans are being developed. Evaluations and long range studies are underway, and enrollment goals are being set. In some states, there is a formal embargo on the creation of new institutions. There are state legislative proposals for reorganizing higher education systems. Mergers are under consideration.

Opinions on such state planning initiatives range from paranoia and alarm to a resigned recognition that tough decisions are going to be made in the 1980s, and they probably need to be made from a state-wide perspective. In any event, as David Breneman and Susan Nelson of the Brookings Institution have recently written, it seems clear that the federal government should stay out of the coming struggle within the states over enrollments and resources. Frankly, I doubt that federal policy-makers will be tempted to intervene. The decisions are going to be difficult politically, and given the complexity and diversity of the 50 state systems of higher education, these matters are better left to the states. There are occasional straws in the wind suggesting that the federal government might move in a more fundamental way into planning and shaping higher education. There is the new U.S. Department of Education, for example. Many in higher education were fearful that creation of a cabinet level department of education might spawn new federal intrusions, new efforts to plan higher education on the national level. But the new department represents, in essence, a reorganization of the Office of Education which has been around for 120 years. It has been a matter of taking the E out of HEW and elevating it to cabinet status, which does not in itself raise federal power to new levels or involve new conceptions of what the federal role is going to be. One hopes, to put a positive cast on it, that the new structure will help make programs run better. We shall see.

Having made my first point that the real action is going to be in the states, the fact remains that the federal government affects higher education through a vast number of agencies and regulations, and the relationship is becoming increasingly adversary in nature. By one count, over 439 separate statutory authorities of the federal government affect postsecondary education. Several studies have been done on the cost of compliance. Ohio State, just for example, reports as part of its cost $50,000 to comply with requirements of the Environmental Protection Agency; $250,000 in staff time and computer charges to comply with the Buckley amendment on privacy rights of students; and $885,000 over two years to meet Occupational Safety and Health requirements. One could go on. There are endless horror stories about overlapping and often conflicting regulations, high legalistic enforcement mechanisms, and insensitivity of federal officials to the nature of academic institutions. One university president argues that the impact of all this amounts to something like confiscatory behavior because of the amount of time and money required. Who is responsible for over-regulation? Congress enacted 45 words in Section 504 of the rehabilitation act barring discrimination against the handicapped, and the result is 10,000 words of printed rules. Title IX regarding campus sex discrimination amounts to 37 words in the enabling legislation; the regulations take 18 three-column pages of fine print in the Federal Register. Is Congress too vague in what it is saying should be done or is the problem bureaucrats running amok and going beyond legislative intent? I suppose there's a bit of truth in both perceptions. The courts, of course, are in the act as well. One analyst, Robert Scott, has written in somewhat apocalyptic tones: "Not only legislatures and federal agencies but the courts as well are willing to scrutinize every exercise of discretion on the basis of a complaint. This is the twilight of autonomy and authority. The prevailing tides of opinion currently are egalitarian and legalistic and they are joined to a simplistic view of society and the likelihood of its improvement."

The question is what can be done? Some say we need to "regulate the regulators." Some say we need a "people's revolt" in order to bring about a reduction of regulation. The Carnegie Council recently called for regulatory impact statements before the issuance of each new set of regulations (I must say I wonder how much more paper would be needed in the Federal Register to carry out that suggestion.)

But not only do we need less paper; I think we also need less rhetoric. I agree with Charles Saunders of the American Council on Education. He has written, "Don't believe any politician who promises deregulation. We can't go back to the glorious days of yesteryear. Regulation is here to stay in a variety of forms." It's too easy to scapegoat nameless bureaucrats. Higher education representatives on the campus and in Washington must make their case issue by issue, pointing out where regulations and mechanisms of enforcement are inappropriate to higher education and where the cost simply outweighs the social benefits. There is no simple answer to the complex dilemma. Broadsides and diatribes against creeping federalism are of little use. We are going to have to proceed case by case, agency by agency in dealing with the problem.

Let me turn finally to student financial aid, which is likely to continue to be the principle mode of federal support for higher education in the 1980s and of very material importance to Montgomery College and other institutions. The growth of federal student aid in the 1970s has been phenomenal. There is now about $5 billion being invested by the federal government in need-tested student aid, which does not include things like Veterans and Social Security education benefits. That is seven times more than what was being spent in 1972, the year in which the decision was made to put the federal emphasis on equal opportunity and student aid rather than institutional support.

I strongly suspect that the relative enrollment strength nationally of higher education these past couple of years has something to do with the availability of student aid. The numbers in the college-age group have leveled off but financial aid appears to be drawing students into higher education who might not otherwise have enrolled. There was a particular spurt last year as a result of the Middle Income Student Assistance Act of 1978 which expanded Basic Educational Opportunity Grants to about 700,000 newly eligible students and opened government-guaranteed loans to all students regardless of income. The new aid very likely is related to the bulge in enrollments in the fall of 1979. The preliminary data show about a 2.5 percent enrollment increase overall and about 4 percent in community colleges.

Along with all the federal money goes considerable responsibility at the campus level. Montgomery College has about 6,000 students on aid of some kind and is packaging about $3 million for students. Montgomery College has done very well relative to other community colleges. Many community colleges pay little attention to student aid. They don't feel they need to. In fact, many four-year schools have considered this kind of clerical matter a low level administrative function that can be handled out of the hip pocket of the institution. The fact is that student aid is big business; there's much at stake for institutions. The number of students being aided and therefore the number of students being processed through financial aid offices, especially after the passage of the middle income legislation, has skyrocketed. The administrative and fiscal responsibility cannot be taken casually. Moreover, institutions are missing opportunities if they overlook the potential of student aid in terms of marketing and recruitment of students in an era of tightening competition.

Let me summarize the three points I have made. Higher education needs to be more concrete and problem-solving, less rhetorical and polemic in its attitude and approach to the perplexing issue of federal regulation. Virtually every accredited college in this country must deal with the complex and growing business of student financial aid, and there's much at stake and much to be gained by institutions that handle this function responsibly and creatively. Finally, I suggest that much of the action that will shape higher education in the 1980s will take place at the state, not the federal level.

TEACHING AND LEARNING

THE CHALLENGE AHEAD

Kenneth Eble, Professor of English
and University Professor, University of Utah

Flying out here last night was a flight into the past, rather than into the future, and I'm going to say something about that past before I attempt any futuristic speculating. Eleven years ago I loaded my family in a station wagon and came to Washington, D.C., as director of a project to improve college teaching. I settled in Kensington, Maryland, just down the road from here. With a modest budget of, I think, $146,000, I was to improve college teaching throughout the United States within two years. The amazing fact was that those of us associated with the project in those years didn't think that was amazing at all. After a busy and satisfying year visiting 50 or 60 colleges east of the Mississippi, I moved the office in the second year to my home, Salt Lake City, and proceeded to improve teaching in the rest of the country. At the end of that year, having pretty well spread improvement everywhere except for some backward areas here and there, the project and I closed up. I went back to teaching and never asked my colleagues whether my absence or presence had the greatest effect on improving teaching at the University of Utah.

About ten years before that, Spring 1959, I made another return of sorts. I had come to Utah in 1955 from Columbia and this time I returned in a form of a manuscript dispatched to the McMillan Company bearing the title, "The Profane Comedy-American Higher Education in the 60s." That book disappeared a long time ago though its remains may have been part of the reason that I was picked to forecast something ahead. I should say that the title, "Higher Education in the 60s" was not mine at all. It was affixed to the book by the McMillan Company with some idea that it would sell books. They were wrong about my predicting ability and wrong about their ability to sell books. But, at any rate, that manuscript contained not my bodily remains but the intellectual and emotional remains of one kind of very typical student in the years after World War II. As a writer and person, that book meant a great deal to me for I wanted to record myself as the student I had been and how teaching and learning had been looked at by me then before I grew any older, before I became a professor myself, before I became part of the establishment, before I became a part of the over 35 crowd. In that book I used the framework of Dante's "Inferno," purgatory, paradise, and the inferno to describe some places I had been as a student and teacher in various institutions of higher learning.

Now let me stay securely in the past for a few moments more, for it may have some bearing on the future. The late '50s and early '60s were clearly a more exciting time for teachers and students, a simpler time than now. Shortly after the profane comedy was published, a reporter from Newsweek called me and asked, "Have you been fired yet?" It was an amusing question to me; in part, because though I only had been at the University of Utah for a few years, I had already absorbed a sense of security about that institution that it wasn't about to fire professors for saying unpopular things, and I was aware that there were other places in which professors were being fired. What offense I might be fired for was very little. The only thing that I could single out really was a sentence that read something like this, "Why do college presidents become such positive boobies when it comes to their athletic programs?" I had not said my college president and I certainly hadn't given his name, though you can make your own judgments about his possible boobiness by considering that he carried a transistor radio to the symphony concerts so he could keep up with the night's basketball games. If one wants a related measure of this simpler world of the late '50s and early '60s, college athletics would be as good a place to start as any. The objections that I raised to college athletics then were chiefly aimed at the way college athletics from the turn of the century on has steadily and successfully incorporated into current operating rules all the practices that were considered illegal, immoral or unethical in the past. I was dead right in my predictions then that this remarkable progress would continue. This year, for example, out in my part of the country we have the practice of offering sports courses thousands of miles from the home campus and often thousands of miles from the athlete supposedly enrolled in them. The practice is being defended, so I recently read, as "legitimate extension of educational opportunity." The joke in my part of the country currently is how many New Mexico basketball players does it take to change a light bulb? The answer is five, one to screw it in and four to get credit. Lest I seem to be straying from my subject, college athletics, I should say, only occupied one chapter in the book "The Profane Comedy." Let me remind myself and you that college sports are still played by supposedly college students who are also supposedly learning from supposed professors in other subjects. It strikes me odd, as I think of it, that in 25 years at the University of Utah and facing perhaps 5,000 undergraduate students, I can remember having only four varsity athletes in my classes, two of whom were good students when (and that was not often) they had a chance to be. You are to bless yourself for being denied the full privilege of big time professional sports, though I note you are under the wing of MJCAA which portends an increasing professionalizing of sports here as elsewhere within higher education. I would also predict that in the '80s community colleges will need to give increasing attention to the possible exploiting of their student athletes by the major college and university franchises of professional athletic teams. College athletics was a depressing subject in the '60s and still is, not because it is not an immensely exciting, freeing youthful activity bringing hundreds of thousands of people together in splendid facilities but because it seemingly cannot exist without corrupting, and because its relation to learning is therefore so dubious. But enough of a depressing subject.

The most important fact of the '60s for community colleges was the decade of remarkable expansion. With respect to this expansion, I must admit to making two right guesses and two wrong opinions. I was right in predicting that the abundance of small struggling private colleges would not diminish as a result of the community college development. I was right, too, in predicting that these small private colleges would continue to be the hardest pressed of collegiate institutions. After a period of relative affluence for some of them in the '60s, the small private college today is again the subject of gloomy predictions about the educational future. I was wrong, I think now, in opposing the development of the public community colleges. I hasten to add this was not because I'm against them in principle. I did not hold, nor do I hold now, an allegiant position which treasured only tradition hallowed four-year liberal arts colleges. My reservations were on purely practical grounds. I did not see how the country, hardpressed to support the existing institutions in the '60s, could support a vast new network of colleges. I was wrong in my analyses, though I consider it something of a miracle, a typical miracle of this strange and marvelous country, that not only did it expand higher education at the beginning, but it expanded it in an unprecedented way at the other end--graduate and research institutions. The question of whether it was wise to do so was quite simply answered by the fact that both were accomplished and pretty much within a decade. I was also wrong, I think in one highminded statement I made about standards and I probably had the community colleges in mind when I wrote, "All colleges must set firm standards though such standards may be higher or lower as befits the institutional aims and the student confidences." Standards, I now think, like letter grades probably do more harm than good and particularly with respect to those individuals most in need of the skills and confidences education can provide. The standards I respect most are those arrived at between teacher and individual student based on that individual student's aims, accomplishments, and potential. Let me conclude this excursion into the past of 20 years ago by speculating on what it may say about the future.

The Challenge Ahead

First, colleges and universities are likely to be pressed financially and without, in many areas, the general promise of increased enrollments that relieved such financial pressures in the '60s. I'm not aware of your exact prospects here, and in any event, I wish to relate financial pressures and pressures to attract students (they often go together) to teaching and learning in a more general way. Such effects exist in good times and bad, only they are emphasized more in bad times. Chiefly, they have to do with trying to reduce the cost of instruction, commonly by increasing teaching loads, by employing technology, and by cutting programs. Much might be said about each of these and safely about the '80s in a general time of financial stringency. Education is not cheap, though there is no precisely established relationship between money spent and learning accomplished. No one has yet established the number of classes, the number of students an average teacher, whatever that is, can best teach. In general, teaching loads in universities have decreased greatly since 1960, decreased less and unevenly in state colleges and remain largest in community colleges. Within community colleges, increasing teaching loads may appear attractive, but if the community college is to maintain that important sense of community and to serve the varied student body which is characteristic of such colleges now and in the future, teachers may need to teach less as measured by class hours of students in order to establish those personal time-consuming relationships which create community and which foster individual learning.

I've been impressed in the community colleges I have visited with the employment of educational technology of many kinds. There seems to be less resistance to it from faculty than in the universities, perhaps more acceptance by students and certainly more of sense of operating in the world of computers, printouts, media, which characterize modern society. I think community colleges will continue to be attracted in these directions and offer only three cautions. With respect to students, instructional technology in itself does little to solve the crucial problems of motivation in learning, nor will it necessarily make learning easier, nor will it do much in the way of synthesizing the acquiring of specific skills and knowledge with a personal growth and development that distinguishes being educated or growing toward wisdom. With respect to teachers, educational technology can both assist and get in the way, relieve a teacher of work and increase his or her work. I think appropriateness and interchange are key words here. The computer, for example, may be highly appropriate to some kinds of instruction, inappropriate to others. What one learns about the use of educational technology in one subject or area can best be extended by teachers exchanging ideas across the various boundaries that define our subject matter. The third caution is directed to administrators chiefly. We have now experienced two full decades and a little more of the adaptation of television to instruction. Though I've read a good many reports comparing learning outcomes on television-taught courses with conventionally taught ones, I have yet to read a careful cost accounting of television instruction versus conventional instruction, learning outcomes aside. I'm being very neutral here. I think I've been able to gain a fair knowledge of the strengths and weaknesses of television instruction and even a good deal of specific information about how to make teaching by television effective, but I still am puzzled as to how much it costs. Because teaching is labor intensive, the presumption seems to be that educational technology is automatically cheaper. I am not sure, and thus I ask for extreme care in the '80s in adopting any form of educational technology as a cost-saving measure.

As to cutting programs, my guess is that community colleges have much less to fear than four-year colleges and universities. I think a continuing strength of the community college in the '80s will be their ability to identify social needs and job skill opportunities and adapt teaching programs to them. Certainly a mark of the '70s has been a shift to career-oriented education with prevailing conditions of inflation, a skepticism toward the economic return of extended higher education and a diminishing, I think, of the distance between work with the hands and with the mind. This makes me believe community colleges will be in a stronger position than ever with respect to the programs they offer. In addition, community colleges such as this have an opportunity to adapt programs to a changing clientele, to adult learners, to women and men returning to college or coming to college for the first time and for other reasons, and with quite different aptitudes and attitudes than those possessed by the typical freshman in a green beanie. I think the teaching within the kind of programs that recognize the nature of the students and the nature of their aims may go very well for teachers in the community college.

Now let me turn to only ten years ago in this cautious sneaking up on the future. Despite the Vietnam war, despite the student protest, despite some indications that a surplus of Ph.Ds was upon us, there was an optimistic air about those years that pretty much has been absent since. In 1972, I addressed a speech to my colleagues in English called "Sobering Up and Staggering Through the '70s." In that speech I likened the '60s to a mild and generally beneficent drunk and counseled them that being sober is not an altogether unhealthy or unhappy condition if not adhered to too strictly and to the exclusion of intoxications of every kind. The project I mentioned went on in an optimistic, if simple-minded way. It had three clear objectives. One, evaluating teaching; two, faculty development; and three optimum working conditions for effective teaching. I think we accomplished a good deal with respect to evaluating teaching, assisted greatly by student pressures to be involved. Within the decade of the '70s, evaluation of teaching has become more systematic, more carefully done, and plays a larger part in the reward structure. Whether it has improved teaching or will continue to if it has, I cannot say, though my guess is that it has increased the attention given to teaching and in a general way may have raised the level of practice. I've always felt that evaluating teaching has been mainly diagnostic in its beneficial effects by having input from the students facing you as teachers in the class. One can continue to learn about those aspects of one's practice that affect learning, and in this respect I continue to support evaluation as a very valuable diagnostic tool.

Faculty development has become something of the big movement in the '70s. It now has a journal, a national meeting, and a core of faculty developers to be called upon by anyone needing developing or more commonly by someone else needing developing. As with evaluation, I have some reservations here. The argument still seems sound that any institution should set aside, as industries do with product development, a reasonable sum to assist faculty in developing and retaining the complex skills and personal qualities that go into effective teaching. But, how any college can best go about it, how the collective faculty and the individuals who make it up can best be reached, and how these then will produce results in the form of enhanced learning of the students are still complex questions. I hope the faculty development movement will continue; that, as it does, it will find more answers and that administrations will give it support.

Our third objective received less attention; that is, optimum working conditions for effective teaching, perhaps because it is a chronic problem and is so enmeshed in an institution's financial position, the nature of the student body, the institutional size and tradition; in short, the whole complex environment that affects teaching and learning. By way of this last subject, optimum working contitions for teaching, let me conclude by peering briefly into the future from the vantage point of today. I take as a text, the latest issue of "Change" in which I came upon three articles that will allow me to say some things perhaps about specific conditions that you are more aware of here than I. The first is by a one-time acquaintance of mine--a man samed Sam Sackett whom I haven't seen since I was in graduate school in New York but whose name I have seen occasionally in scholarly articles. This piece begins and I'll read the first two paragraphs: "For 23 years I taught at a publicly supported four-year university that offers bachelor's and master's degrees. I rose to the rank of full professor in the English department there. I hold a doctorate from a major university. In 1977 I found that I could no longer stand to work at the university and I left in the middle of the semester. Recently, I taught for a year at a privately owned business college. My experience has given me an unusual insight into the differences between these two types of institutions. In my opinion, the differences are all in favor of the business college."

Now, I won't take time to detail Mr. Sackett's disaffection with the state university nor all the pluses he found in teaching at the business college, but some, I think, apply to the advantages also held by community colleges such as yours and I hope you will continue to exploit them in the '80s.

I turn to his text again. What did I find, he writes, at Salt Lake City Business College in Hutchinson, Kansas? "An administration and staff that were truly student centered," and then a bit later, "I found more interest in human instinct education than I had ever seen among my humanistic colleagues at a university," and again, "students were sometimes reluctant and not always free of the bad educational habits left by 12 years in the public schools but were open to being taught," and then his peroration is "The university prides itself on the liberal arts which are the arts appropriate to free man but what is liberating about being required to take courses that are offered only because teachers won't risk teaching anything they have not themselves been taught?" What is liberating about having to attend classes that are called general education only because the designation insures a full teaching load for a professor who could not otherwise attract students. No matter what the liberal arts may have been in the days of Cicero, today it is the business colleges that are rendering students truly liberated, liberated from the cycle of poverty, liberated to discover their potential and fulfill it."

And without trying to guess at whether Mr. Sackett is reflecting his own malaises or larger malaises, I think there is a good deal to be said for what the community colleges have often done best, namely, helping to liberate students from the cycle of poverty, to discover their potential and fulfill it.

The second article in "Change" magazine is one titled, "How Public Institutions Vie for Brighter Students," and a good deal of its research was conducted here from the statistics furnished by the University of Maryland. It's one of the research articles that frequently come into "Change" and acquaints us with some specific aspect of higher education. What interests me about this article is that these publicly supported institutions are universities and the table of data shows impressive increases from 1965-66 to the present in the number of national merit scholars enrolled. At the University of Maryland, for example, the increase is 4.3 percent, but at the University of Virginia nearby, it is 26 percent. How, I ask myself and I ask you, do the community colleges fare or is even this a realistic question to ask in relation to competing for bright students?

I see two counter movements affecting community colleges in the '80s in this respect. The one is in the direction of community colleges as the places the students go if they can't get in anywhere else; the other is toward making the student body more representative of a community, gaining its share of bright students, talented students in other ways and students who represent a cross-section of the community served. Until recent times, this article goes on, "most of the public institutions regarded it as inappropriate and elitist to show the bright students special favor." Community colleges might consider the kind of active recruiting that is described in this article, not because bright students are better to have than less bright students but because students can learn a great deal from other students and the unplanned as well as planned exclusion of good students lowers the learning possibilities for all students.

This leads me to the last of these articles and the last of my crystal-ball gazing. It's a wistful plea for an academic community written by a professor at the University of Southern California. His opening paragraph is conventionally depressing in its outlook for college teaching in the '80s. It goes like this: "If there is any consensus in higher education, it is that professors are in for a long summer. The era of expansion is over. Tenured professors are in danger of losing their jobs. Department chairpersons wait anxiously from semester to semester hoping their enrollments will hold. Anger, frustration, and depression are rapid. Many faculty are in their fifth or sixth year of salary raises that are less than the increase in inflation. The question often raised is what are the options as faculty and administrators?" The article does not end on that pessimistic note and in fact, goes on to propose "many of us need to slow down to a pace where we can experience community." I think here lies a great opportunity for community colleges, an opportunity to assert even more than they have the idea of community. The community colleges like urban colleges everywhere have many forces working against community--a working and commuting and often part-time student body hard pressed by the necessities of keeping alive within a fragmented urban setting. Nevertheless, I think the student-centered teaching which characterizes community colleges will be more attractive to students and more satisfying to teachers in the '80s.

Community is not only made possible by a residential small college in a pastoral setting. In urban areas it exists around centers of identification, shopping malls for example, which surely have less going for them than a college such as this.

Community also comes from an identification with matters of great importance. If a small college appears to afford a trivial or marking time existence for its students, it may forge no real community. As hard pressed as a community college faculty and student body may be, the engagements and studies which relate directly to one's work and one's life are a real help in forging communal ties. Community can be reinforced in teaching by the personal attention and interaction between students and faculty and family possible in the community college. The greater flexibility in teaching styles and practices that I've seen in community colleges should continue as a distinctive characteristic. Less stands in the way of cooperative rather than competitive learning within the community college. Teaching which aims at students and teachers learning together and in the realistic context of actual jobs and services can flourish in the community college.

My final point is a feeling that the community colleges, after two decades of getting established and developing, are in a position to assert in their central teaching and learning missions their own distinctive characteristics. I do not see any dramatic changes in teaching and learning methods in the '80s. For the present, I somewhat fear that continued moving back to supposed verities of teaching which threatens the kind of openess, flexibility, individualization, and imaginative commitment that came into teaching somewhat at the same time as the community colleges were developing. Such old-fashioned matters as concern for the student, whatever his or her background and capacities, the exercise of common sense and understanding as well as a mastery of subject matter in teaching, the willingness to develop specific pedagogic skills and to make use of adjuncts to instruction, the ability and tenacity to find ways to motivate students will be just as important in the '80s as ever.

I wish you well in adapting to changing conditions and keeping learning and teaching the exciting and satisfying enterprise they always have been.

THE ADULT STUDENT IN THE 1980s

Jamison Gilder, Director, Lifelong Education Project,
American Association of Community and Junior Colleges

Before I discuss lifelong education and the topic of adult students in the 1980s, I'd like to preface with something my grandfather always told me. He heard Geraldine say, "Don't let your mouth write no checks that your body can't cash." I've interpreted that to mean that we shouldn't be raising the expectations of our adult students in the 1980s if we are not able to meet those expectations. My role is to try to encourage a more favorable policy framework for lifelong education so that when adult students of the 1980s come to us we will be ready with administrative, fiscal and instructional policies that work for them.

Lifelong education is a subject that for lack of specificity has become a cotton-candy idea. People say "Jamie, I can't sink my teeth into this idea; it's hard for me to understand what adult students are going to be like because I don't understand adult learning. I don't understand lifelong education as a policy or as a type of learning."

The first thing I would like to do is to share with you a temporary categorization and separation about adult students that I find helpful. There are three fundamentally separate groups of adult students and three separate sets of adult learning needs that imply three different fiscal and governance policies in our framework for meeting the needs of adult students.

The first set of needs is what I call the universal common core learning needs, and those obviously are the basic reading, writing, and computation skills that most of us learn at an early age. But for many people who come from different circumstances those are still unmet learning needs. On the other hand, when we look ahead into the 1980s a person like me becomes an illiterate because I do not know any data processing programming languages. Even if the communications company came and installed a terminal in my home (to order groceries, for example,) I would be functionally illiterate. I do not know how to communicate in a system like that. I don't know my way around a simple telephone keyboard that's been hooked to a microprocessor, for example, and I strongly believe that by 1989 that is going to be a basic functional skill. So when I group the universal common core learning needs, I not only mean those basic skills that have been with us since the advent of universal free public education 200 years ago, but I mean those that are developing so fast with the technology that we aren't keeping up with them. So, the first set of adult needs are these universal basic learning needs, old and new.

The second set of distinct adult learning needs is what I call the situational, circumstantial needs. These are the learning needs a person has in order to build, occupy, and maintain an economic niche for himself or herself, something that is beyond the universal need and is specific to that individual. We have all kinds of value systems in our culture that mean professional skills are valued more than technical skills and certain kinds of vocational skills are valued less. I believe if we separate the value system we can lump together: occupational, vocational, technical, and professional learning needs as those that help an individual person to occupy a specific economic niche in the culture. These specific needs are different from the kinds of common needs we all share. They encompass not only the entry level skills, but also the advancing and maintenance skills that a person needs.

The third set of adult student learning needs is one that encompasses the category of personal learning needs--the kinds of things we want to know as people in order to develop ourselves, enrich our minds, understand our interpersonal and intercultural relations, and our religious, ethnic, artistic and humanistic needs to describe and understand the universe. These, I believe, can be segregated from the universal basic skills we need in order to survive and participate in the culture, and from the needs that help us to occupy an economic niche to feed, clothe and help ourselves. The personal needs are different. Much of the recent work in adult development addresses these needs.

I said earlier that I would discuss what the students of the 1980s will be like. If we look at the above three categorizations of needs it will tell us something about what the students are going to be like. We know that the ethnic composition of the population is changing and that our delivery systems for basic skills are going to be needed in new areas of the country and in new delivery mechanisms to new ages of individuals. Different new subcultures will appear, and participation is going to be much broader than many people are imagining. Everyone here at Montgomery College, although we don't yet consider ourselves to be potential illiterates, is likely to be illiterate in a new sense within five to ten years, and so the future non-traditional basic skill student is likely to be the heretofore accomplished and educated person.

On the other hand, when we look at the occupational, vocational, technical, and professional learning programs, we're seeing those gates already opening up to new populations. We're seeing middle-aged Hispanic women looking at law school as a possibility for the first time. We're seeing Black students go to medical school. And, this is something that has only started to happen in the last decade or so in consistent numbers. So, many of our students in these occupational, vocational, technical, and professional programs are going to be the kinds of students who haven't participated in the past. On the other hand, we're seeing the kinds of students who used to participate in those programs going into other kinds of fields. If you look for example, at the numbers of women going into the construction fields and into the data processing fields and into the engineering and chemical fields--the numbers are changing steadily. And, when we look at the category of adult learners interested in personal development, and social and intellectual development, we see classrooms filled with students other than white, middle-aged women from suburban backgrounds who used to be the primary participants. One good thing about the 1970s was its validation for people to be interested in "Me," to be interested in self-development, and so I think we will have many more students participating in those kinds of programs.

What are the policy implications of adult learners and their varied needs? If we examine the bedrock of federal education policy, most people will agree that it is equal opportunity; that everything we do in education, the way dollars flow, and the way laws and court decisions are interpreted, always comes back to equal opportunity as the bedrock policy. And yet, if we look at the way our institutions' regulations and programs are now structured, I submit that we in fact practice something quite different. As an example, we know from the large research programs over the years that it is unrealistic to expect an individual to perform and advance in a technical program or job unless he or she has the fundamental skills with which to transfer occupations and understand and solve problems. Nevertheless, millions of dollars go into CETA programs, WIN programs, YEDPA programs, and various VocEd programs. I suggest that, taken alone, is the opposite of an equal opportunity policy. If what we mean to do is to bring in as many new learners as possible into our training, learning and teaching system, then the entry port is basic skills. On the other hand, if we look at the numbers of dollars and the distribution of student financial aid programs like the BEOG programs and SEOG programs and others, we have billions of dollars going into what for some intents and purposes is personal development. Some students get a liberal arts education on federal subsidies when other people are being frozen out of the system, by being left out of basic skills development programs. I know that raises a lot of eyebrows and raises a lot of questions but I think it should because when we track the dollar investments in teaching, learning, and training, and when we put them in at a level above which they can be sustained by the student, then we're making a poor investment. I don't think we can measure the damage we do to an individual when we offer a $10,000 a year CETA job that evaporates at the end of the year leaving them unemployed again because they didn't get the basic skills or training to go on.

I believe that the fundamental responsibility for basic skills, and involving new learners, and making sure that individuals are streamed in rather than frozen out is a federal responsibility. We have in the past left this as a state's right issue except for cases where it became untenable as in the desegregation and handicapped problems. On the other hand, meeting needs in occupational, vocational, technical, and professional programs is something that can be primarily a state responsibility. We're talking about support of local economy, an interstate commerce, rather than this being a federally supported activity. I believe it should be primarily a state-supported activity. Finally, when we talk about individuals developing themselves in order to contribute to the culture in exchange for what they've drawn out, we're talking about a personal responsibility. So the policy implications for our students in the 1980s are profoundly different from what they have been up to now in terms of who pays for what programs with what kind of outcome expectations in what kinds of institutions.

THE ADULT STUDENT IN THE 1980s

Rexford Moon, Managing Director, College Board's Future Directions
for a Learning Society Program

I thought as I came in this building that we were all in the Woody Allen syndrome because we got to the top of the stairs and if any of you were thinking about the direction in which you were going, it was somewhat like that Woody Allen situation: you could either go up the stairs for total destruction or come down to hear about possible decline. I want you to know you're going to hear a lot of good news and a lot you're not going to agree with. I want you to remember that what I have to say is in contrast to the opening remarks from the Sloan Commission which feels that the adult population in America does not represent a significant enough force for it to be counted on to influence in a major way the future direction of higher education in this country. I take exactly the opposite position. I think the next two decades are going to be extremely dramatic, dynamic, exciting, unstable and undefinable. From time to time, they will be quite difficult to describe.

You have in your materials the background for this session containing two publications from us--one called "350 Ways that Colleges and Universities are Working with Adults" and the other "Alternative Future Scenarios for the Country," which was based upon a fairly extensive national panel effort that we undertook a year or so ago. I want to tell you quickly about the College Board because I think a lot of people, including Ralph Nader, have very limited understanding of what the College Board is. It is not a business. It is not an industry. It's an association of colleges not unlike the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges. It's a non-profit association, has 2,500 members, half of which are colleges and universities and the other half of which are schools and school systems. We operate a variety of services, including guidance services, testing programs, placement programs, etc. We do that out of the central office in New York, nine regional offices and our office in Washington. We're governed by a board of trustees. We have a staff of approximately 230. We contract with Educational Testing Service for some of our work, but we also contract with others. We have an income slightly in excess now of $60 million and we serve each year roughly four million secondary and higher education students and provide information and services to some 3,000 institutions. The primary purpose and mission, however, of the College Board is to foster access and transition in education, and that's why now in this current day and age we are especially interested in what's going to happen to the adult in our society.

This is the thing that we talk about as far as declining enrollment in postsecondary education in the United States and those numbers run from 1960 on the left to 1995 on the right, and that's simply the number of 18 to 21 year olds in the United States. That doesn't take much to understand; but this is the chart that seemed to me that the future of education in America must be planned around, and that's the one that is considerably more complicated. That chart shows the shifting dimensions of the population in this country from the year 1950 to the year 2000. The bottom chart indicates the 17 to 24 year olds, or the 18 to 21 year olds, or whatever you want to call them. We know pretty much now about the form of that and what it is going to look like. We know that people are getting older or we hear occasionally the average age of going to college is rising, or this or that, but we really haven't looked carefully at the shape of those and the general obviously upward trend for most all of them. Now, there's only one thing that you have to remember. The number of people by the year 2000 will be 50 million more than there are in 1980. There will be 50 million more people in that age range by the year 2000 than there are in that point right now. And I'll just make a very casual observation. If the participation rates of that segment of the population doesn't change, if it continues to participate at the same rate, which is roughly 18 and some point percentages, you can see what an additional 50 million people in the population by the year 2000 could have on the institutional sectors or other sectors of our society. Now, if there is any anticipation of increase in participation and there is some evidence of this now after studying it for some 10 years, then the anticipations can be even higher.

It is important that we think of what are some of the major factors in our society that are driving us toward a much higher participation by adults in organized learning activities. Well, there's a list of them. They're varied. Some of them are highly personal. Those of you who have worked in institutions like this know if you're aiming your programs and services at those people you have satisfied customers, and they come back, and the increasing levels of satisfaction which the adult has experienced in higher education, I think, has a very definite multiplying effect.

Secondly, what we call the life career change phenomenon in our society. The two studies that we have done with respect to national trends through the year 2000--societal trends, personal trends, etc.--simply say to us that the factors we understand now that tend to motivate people to seek learning are going to accelerate. The instability in both the career picture and the family picture seem to us, from the evidence that we have now, to contribute most to participation in learning activities by adults, and the only thing we can see happening is greater intensification of change in those areas which will, in turn, increase the intensification of participation in learning activities. There are various payment opportunities, requirements, student aid changes, planning initiatives, a new department of education, better counseling.

One of the most important factors that hasn't been really mentioned today as a major force in changing the participation rates of adults in education in the future will be aggressive marketing by institutions. My sense is that if you go back over the period of higher education since World War II, the combination of the G.I. Bill, plus the marketing intensity of institutions, are the two major contributors to the tremendous interest in participation in an acceptance of the importance of education in our society. Don't just assume that people have come to college and university quite normally--no, they have not! They have been attracted to colleges and universities. They've been promised things by colleges and universities, or by society, and the college is acting as their agent. There's been a very successful and very aggressive marketing program to bring traditional age students to our colleges and universities and that's been geared up now to offer similar attractive opportunities for adults, and that will have a very major effect, I think, on increasing the participation rates in our society.

There's another phenomenon in our society which I call unfulfilled expectations. You heard somebody say this morning, "We know there are people who would like to try this; we have heard about people who would like to get involved but they don't show up." That's some dimension of who those people are, of the magnitude of those people. Now, when we talk about percentages, remember we're multiplying that percentage by such numbers as 150 million, which is roughly the population in the adult learning category right now, or if you want to take this out to the year 2000, 200 million, so when we talk about 40 percent of the adults or 80 percent of the adults or 60 percent of the adults, we're talking about one helluva lot of people.

We've just finished another interesting research project called "Americans in Transition," and we've been trying to pinpoint some better explanations as to why adults participate in learning activities. There have been lots of reasons given. Well, because they're white, and therefore if you're white you're more likely to participate in education than if you're black. I mean, these are reasons that have been given over the past to explain participation. If you have above average income then you're more likely to participate than if you've not. And, if you've had higher levels of schooling, you're more likely to participate than for people who have not. We didn't think that went deep enough, so we went out into the countryside and asked people first of all to find out how many felt that they were involved in some kind of learning activities and, remember now, I'm talking about every place--colleges, schools--and we only found that roughly 30% to 35% were involved in school activities or institutional related. They're involved in all kinds of things. We found 50% of the adults in America said they were involved in some kind of an organized learning activity and then we tried to find out the factors that contributed to their involvement to get them to undertake a learning experience. This is not what they wanted to study or what they were studying. We wanted to try to establish that there are highly personal factors that tended to trigger people to undertake a learning activity. Secondly, we wanted to identify the areas where those triggers might be most prevalent. And, that's about as far as we've gone at the present time. But we found that of the 50 percent of the people who said they were involved in a learning activity, 56 percent said it was because of some event or series of events related to their career and generally career to them meant their job, whether it was seeking a new job or that the boss had suggested they take a course. No wonder so many people seem to be taking courses in adult learning programs, credit and non-credit. It seems to relate to their job.

The next area that seems to have the highest triggering effect was the family situation, changes in the family situation, and so on down the line. There's a sense of logic about this. Don't be terribly awed by the results. We think it does explain the whole phenomenon in a way different than it has been explained in the past.

One of the most discouraging things we found was in a society where we're saying people's interest in participation in political activity, etc., is at a low ebb, we found that people indeed reinforce that as any kind of trigger as far as their learning activities were concerned. Maybe you would be interested in this one other thing about that study as to where people found--these were the locations they indicated they were turning to as far as some type of learning experience was concerned. The largest single category, if you lump all those together starting with the local school district down to the proprietary school is the institutional sector. Colleges and universities and two-year institutions are high in that grouping. What really astounded us was to see the high number of four-year colleges and universities. We thought we would find a much higher percentage identified with the community and junior college. I don't have any explanation as to why that happened. Some people say we may have had a bigger problem with our sample than we realized. That's why I say take these as groups and look at them as groups rather than examining each one individually as a certainty of the present situation.

I promised you a rose garden. This is the good news picture, the rosy picture for the future. This is the one I want you to take away in your mind. There are three simple categorizations of learning activity connected only with higher education institutions in our country. There's nothing in here having to do with what churches do or what the Army does or what employers do or anything else. This is only what colleges and universities have been doing with respect to a very simple category called "full-time credit enrollment," and then "part-time credit enrollment" and a last category called "part-time non-credit enrollment." Now, to get those three things, you have to go to three different reports. Nobody bothers to put this information out altogether; they just put them out at different times, different places, different sources. But, if you want to put some of this stuff together, this is what you come up with. There are about seven million people called "full-time degree credit students" and there are approximately five million degree credit part-time students. Now you've heard about higher education enrollment--12 million. When people say we have an enrollment in higher education in America 12 million and it's 7 plus 5; that's where it comes from. Part-time enrollment for credit, generally adult students, is now slightly over 40% of total enrollment for credit in higher education. I am betting that within the next three years, it'll pass it; that some place between 1980 and 1985 we're going to have more part-time general adult students working for credit in our institution than we have full-time students.

Last fall the National Center on Educational Statistics put out a report which really brought out sharply for the first time the number of people involved in learning activities in colleges and universities that they were undertaking not for credit. The definitional problems have been difficult, but it shows there are 10 million people taking non-credit classes. So in 1980, we have seven million full-time, five million part-time, and ten million part-time not for credit students. Roughly, what we have discovered is that there has been not only an increase in numbers of adults participating in education activities, either as credit or non-credit part-time, but that rate is increasing and it has been increasing quite steadily since back in 1960 when the numbers like this were first beginning to accumulate. This represents an appropriate, significant scenario for higher education in the next 20 years. If we're off, we're off by a relatively, I think, small percent. But, what it does say is this--that somewhere down the road 75% to 80% of the people involved in our postsecondary institutions 20 years from now will be known as part-time, non-credit students. They will look for a much greater diversity of learning opportunities than even you are offering your students today. They will look for the recognition of their prior learning experience. They will look for different kinds of ways to learn and different kinds of people to teach them.

MANPOWER NEEDS IN THE 1980s:

An Overall Perspective for the Washington Metropolitan Area

Rufus Daniels, Chief, Branch of Labor Market Information and Analysis,
District of Columbia Department of Labor

The District of Columbia Department of Labor is the state employment security agency for the District of Columbia and, in addition to all of its other normal functions, it has the responsibility for labor market information for the entire metropolitan area which includes Montgomery County as well as Prince George's and Charles County, Maryland, four counties and several independent jurisdictions in Virginia, as well as the District of Columbia.

To talk about manpower needs in Metropolitan Washington, I'd like to say a few words to give a national backdrop against which we will discuss the topic.

It is estimated that the national economy will generate nearly 20 million new jobs between 1978 and 1990. According to a recent projection by the Bureau of Labor statistics, the clerical workers category (including bank tellers, bookkeepers, cashiers, secretaries, typists) constitutes the largest and fastest growing white collar occupational category. Employment growth in these occupations in the nation is expected to generate almost five million jobs in that time period. Professional and technical occupations (which include many highly trained workers such as scientists and engineers, medical practitioners, teachers, entertainers, pilots and accountants) are expected to increase by 2.6 million. About 2.1 million new jobs are expected to be generated for managers in that 1978-1990 period. Employment growth for sales workers is expected to generate about 1.6 million jobs. Much of this growth will be due to expansion in the retail trade industry which employs nearly one-half of sales workers. Blue collar workers which include craftsmen, operatives and laborers are expected to account for only about one quarter of the nation's employment growth by 1990.

Employment growth in the highly skilled craft worker group is expected to add about 2½ million new jobs to the economy. Service workers (which include cooks and chefs, cosmetologists, police officers, practical nurses, child care workers, etc.) is expected to be the fastest growing occupational category, generating some 3.8 million jobs. Employment of farm workers including farmers and farm operators as well as farm laborers will continue to decline as productivity rises and the number of farms continues to fall. Employment growth will represent only part of the demand for new workers by 1990. The need to replace workers who die, retire, or leave the labor force for other reasons is expected to produce 47 million job openings between 1978 and 1990, which is more than twice that which is expected to be created by industrial growth. Even in declining industries or declining occupations, there is still possibility for jobs to be available.

With this backdrop, let's talk now about the manpower needs for the 1980s for the Washington, D. C., Metropolitan Area. The needs that we are going to discuss did not occur in a vacuum and so a statement of underlying factors may be of value for your consideration. When one thinks of manpower needs, it's usually in terms of an occupation similar to those large occupational groups that I just mentioned in painting a national picture. The occupational structure of any area and its resulting forecast of openings is highly and directly influenced by the industrial structure, and this brings us to the basis for occupational demands and forecasts. The powers-that-be sometime ago decided that the seat of national government would be located on the banks of the Potomac, not very far from here where Maryland meets Virginia at a place called the District of Columbia. The die was cast at that time that would determine industrial and occupational structure for a long time to come. Therefore, it is common knowledge that the primary economic generator for this area had been, is now, and probably will be for sometime the administration, care and feeding of the federal government. As of December, 1979, the federal government directly employed almost 25% of non-agricultural wage and salaried persons in the Washington Metropolitan Area. You probably remember reading not long ago a recent local newspaper article that chronicled the vast research and development or government contracting activity in this area, some of which is located on Interstate 270 and quite a bit over in the Tysons Corner area. Now if all of that immediately indirect employment work were quantified, the percentage would rise substantially above the 25% that I just mentioned a moment ago. Inasmuch as the administration of the government is the economic and employment generator, the government is essentially a service and so it naturally follows that our state of being for the area is also service oriented. This can be fairly easily demonstrated by a set of statistics on industry activity employment for 1974 and projected through 1985. That set of data is classified as the name suggests by the activity in which a person is actually working rather than by who pays the person, and that was done for occupational projection purposes because we had to apply established industry occupational staffing patterns to specific industry groups in order to get a total of occupational staffing patterns. Some of the most recognizable variances in the data is that it seems that the level of government employment is low relative to all the other employment, especially when we talk about government being a company town around here. And, you might also notice that the title does not say government--it says government public administration. The employment figures in that division are reflective of the persons associated directly just with the administration of the government and would exclude such persons as teachers, doctors, policemen, firemen, etc., who are employed and paid by governments but who render services which can be readily classified into other industry groups. These persons mentioned are indeed service personnel and so they are classified in the educational, medical and protective service sectors of the service industry division.

Likewise, government printers would fall in printing and publishing, which is a part of manufacturing, and the carpenters would fall in construction, and the gardeners would fall in agriculture, foresters, and fishers and so on. The service orientation of our area accounts for about one-third of the employment, both in 1974 and 1985, and that's followed fairly closely by government administration and the trade divisions--wholesale and retail--with about 24% and 18% respectively.

As you might assume, each industry has a unique occupational distribution. For example, we would expect that there would be more carpenters in the construction industry than would be in wholesale and retail trade, although there are carpenters in both. We would likewise expect that there would be more salespersons in the wholesale and retail industry grouping than there are in the service industry, although there are salesmen in both of those. So given that fact and the industrial mixture for the Washington, D. C. area that we've painted, then Washington has an unique occupational structure as might be compared to nearby Baltimore, or areas such as Pittsburgh, Cleveland, or Detroit, all of which are manufacturing centered geographic areas. The occupational structure for the Washington Metropolitan area is very white-collar oriented. The clerical and professional categories combined comprise one-half of the employment estimate for 1980. In 1980 employment for the Washington Metropolitan area will include service workers and managers, both of which account for approximately 12% each, and sales workers and operatives comprise nearly 6% each. Laborers fall near the bottom with 3%, and the farmers and farm workers category is less than 1%. This is essentially unchanged for the 1974 and 1985 period upon which all of these statistics are based. Clerical workers is a category that has been the largest in this Metropolitan area historically and probably will be for some time to come.

Manpower Needs in the 1980s

There are two sets of statistics that are reflective of total employment at a given point in time, both industrial and occupational. Perhaps a little more directly related to the theme of this conference is a look at the demand for approximately how many new jobs are going to be open every year. This set of statistics is a little more dynamically oriented because it reflects the growth of the industries and movement of people as a result of changes in their labor force staffs. So, each year between 1974 and 1985, it's projected that openings will average slightly over 95,000 in this Metropolitan area. When we talk about openings, we can look at those from two perspectives: one because industries expand and grow and the other because people have to be replaced, as I mentioned earlier, because of retirement, movements away from a geographic area, resignations from the labor force and because of the grim reaper. The major occupational categories almost exactly mirror what we have talked about before and this is natural and logical. The largest occupational category (clerical workers) is expected to have the largest amount of openings per year--more than 35,000 and that happens to be about a third of all the openings that will occur. The principle reason for the great number of openings in the clerical category is because of the concentration of government and service industry employment in the area and because of a higher replacement demand in the clerical category, and that high replacement is due in part to the high proportion of women who hold clerical jobs, when in addition to taking the responsibility for working in the job, also take responsibility for childbearing and rearing, and this takes time from the labor force. Nearly half of all the clerical openings that will occur will be for secretaries, typists, and stenographers. The introduction and proliferation of word processing machines will not in any way change our forecast for the need of clerical workers. There will have to be somebody to operate that machine. A person might be called something else but will still be a clerical worker.

Manpower Needs in the 1980s

Professional, technical, and kindred workers can expect about 21,000 annual openings. One of the major groups within this professional category is engineers for which we'll have an estimated 2,100 yearly openings. Engineering and science technicians are expected to have 1,400 job openings. A little closer to home as far as the curriculum here is concerned might be computer specialists whose jobs are expected to be opening at a rate of 1,300 per year. Also, some 2,000 teachers will be needed per year, but this is considered relatively low when compared to some others because of slow growth in the area of teachers. But, because of the number that has to be replaced, there is still a substantial number of openings expected to occur each year for teachers. Managers, officials, and proprietors are expected to have openings at the rate of 8,900 per year, mostly for administrators, public inspectors, buyers, and sales and loan managers. Sales workers will be needed at about the rate of 5,900 annually. Even with the slight damping of sales and real estate, real estate agents and brokers show the most openings in this category with some 900 openings annually. Among the top 40 occupations in terms of the number demanded per year include general secretaries, typists, cashiers, bookkeepers, practical nurses, editors and reporters, statistical clerks, computer programmers, legal secretaries, childcare workers, drafters, and bank tellers. The 40 top demand occupations account for about half of the openings that are expected to occur. Some other occupations are not necessarily what we call the high forty but have significant relevance because of curriculum offerings here at the junior college level; those include clinical laboratory technicians, dental hygienists (which is the fastest growing single occupational group in the whole forecast), legal secretaries, medical secretaries, computer and peripheral equipment operators, dental assistants and health aides.

This gives us something of a view of the needs for manpower that we expect for the Washington Metropolitan Area in the 1980s.

SPECIAL STUDENT POPULATIONS

SPECIAL STUDENT POPULATIONS:

The Role of the Community College in Meeting the Educational Needs of Handicapped People

Leslie Milk, Executive Director, Mainstream, Incorporated

I am violating an important principle by speaking here today. I do not speak in rooms where there are no interpreters for the hearing impaired. I do not speak at conferences that are not opened to hearing impaired people because there are no interpreters for them and there is no interpreter here. But if I don't speak, then you are never going to realize how many people are not here and why they aren't here and then you're not going to be prepared to receive them. I don't think it's an accident that there are not too many disabled people attending this workshop. I think it's because the barriers are so subtle but so pervasive that you're not even aware of them. You're assuming that if there was somebody who was deaf, for example, you would have made provision for them. The fact that there isn't anybody is the important thing. The fact that nobody in this room wheeled in rather than walked in means that obviously a whole segment of society is being excluded from the decision-making process taking place here during the next two days. Somehow we seem to think that the barriers exist only for very severely disabled people. Whenever I get into an academic institution, I just cannot help it--I have to tell you about my academic experience because I have this very little disability--no accommodation necessary. I have a crippled arm as a result of a birth injury, and I want my university to get full credit for everything that happened to me. So, I'll spell it out for you.

When I arrived at Syracuse, I truly believed that no accommodation for me was going to be necessary, but I hadn't reckoned on academic communities.

The first thing I learned at Syracuse was that there was a freshman requirement for something called placard cheering. In schools that really focus on football, they have big stadiums and one of the freshman requirements is that all freshmen learn a very important skill and that is how to placard cheer. They're little squares of cardboard and when large groups of people hold up these squares of cardboard, they spell out really pithy sayings like "go team, go" and you get specific places where you've got to do this. I don't want you to think that it does not take great logistical planning to get that "go team, go" saying exactly what it is supposed to. They put me in the right spot. I had my beanie on right. I had my placard with one side orange and one side blue. Whenever I did this, I could never get the right placard up in time. It got to the point where the football team was beginning to look for me in the stadium. You know that Syracuse is not a football powerhouse any more. The coach left after this. He was totally demoralized, and I was fired from placard cheering. But I could take it and then I went on to my next academic course. I studied journalism.

At Syracuse University, they had a course called Graphic Arts 54 A and B, two semesters, learning how to set type. The theory is that you cannot get printer's ink into your veins unless you get some of it on your hands. You learn to set type the way kids still do in junior high school, I assume. Nobody has used this process for the last 50 years. It is an academic requirement. You don't graduate from journalism school until you can do this. Well, you remember I'm the one who can't use this arm. These are great big type trays full of heavy metal type. Am I going to tell anybody? Of course not, because I know the minute you let them know you're a "crip," that's it. I was immediately going to be disqualified from journalism on the grounds that I would never be able to undertake two-handed drinking, and so I say no way I'm going to tell them, and I pick up that type tray and I drop it on this guy's foot. We are assigned places, and I want you to know for two solid weeks I'm dropping it on this same guy's foot. He is now a legitimate handicapped fellow by the way. This was before Title IX; and so he asked me finally after about the third week, "Do you mind if I lift up the type tray for you?" It wasn't chivalry. It was enlightened self-interest. I got through Graphic Arts 54 A and B. He didn't do so well, but I got through. And, I managed to get through any number of interesting and arcane assignments in journalism school until two weeks before graduation when they announced that one of the requirements to be a journalist was you had to be able to type 30 words a minute, and I couldn't do it. I was really into the Clark Gable hunt-and-peck school. You go down to the Washington Post--they're still doing it. But my journalism school knew about academic requirements. I had a scholarship from vocational rehabilitation and so the State of New York went to Syracuse University and said, "We don't care if she writes her stories on stone tablets. The voters of New York State have spent an awful lot of money to make her a journalist." So I was allowed to graduate.

All I am telling you is that these kinds of barriers faced me in academia. I know, therefore, that when I come into a room like this and I see only what we call TABs (temporarily able-bodied) that those barriers are still here. Unless things change very drastically and you do something very creative, they're going to be here in the 1980s. And I think it's important that you know that while this is a very atypical community in terms of per capita income, education level and a lot of other things, it is a very typical community when you start dealing with disability. You have more advocates here with less influence and that is because you're still dealing with invisible people. One of the most important things that this college needs to do is to reach out into the community to find out where the disabled people are, who they are, and what they need in order to get into this community. For example, over lunch I heard about a facility in Germantown, an accessible multi-disciplinary laboratory. And I said this sounds terrific--how many handicapped students do you have using it? None. Who knows about it? Well, if you're in Germantown, you might. But how many kids are there in the entire Metro-Washington Area who would love to go to an accessible lab? How many of them know about it? Probably none.

What do disabled consumers in this County need from this College? How many meetings of the Maryland Association for Advocates with the Handicapped ever have been held here? How many times has the National Association of the Deaf ever come here? Or the National Federation for the Blind? Or any of the other numerous disabled consumer organizations? How many times have they ever been involved in a program here and how many of them were invited to bring people here today? Are these groups part of the outreach list? And again, how many times have they been held in places these people can reach under circumstances and conditions that these people can participate in? It's one thing to say we have an open door and it's quite another to actually open it.

I understand that the State Board for Community Colleges has designated Montgomery College specifically for dealing with people with learning disabilities. But you are covered by Federal law which says you must be open to people of all disabilities, regardless of what the state says you should specialize in. Another thing is that this College is uniquely situated close to a national center of disabled people's activity. More national organizations for disabled people are located in Washington than anywhere else in the country. More thinking concerned with independent living, communication barriers, and other things goes on here, and I think it is very important in the future that you start involving them in planning; that you start having what is offered here, both academically and socially, for the community reflect the concerns that these people are beginning to reflect; that you start modeling developments in other places. I think it's also important to recognize that the law we talked about which says you must be open to all also says you must be open to all non-restrictively. It is one thing to offer special programs for handicapped people, but the law says that those people must be mainstreamed. In other words, those programs must integrate the disabled and the non-disabled and where courses are specifically designed to meet the needs of only handicapped people and whole academic streams are so created, they are dooming those people to failure, because the world is not constituted that way. When you are dealing with disabled young adults, the greatest academic thing you can do for them is to teach them to deal with that and when you are dealing with young academic TABs, you are doing a tremendous service to prepare them to deal with disability. I think that you would find many of your students ready and willing to participate in programs which will bring hearing impaired and hearing students together, physically disabled and non-disabled students together. I wonder how many opportunities they've had. Probably, the most important thing is, are you practicing what you preach? How many disabled faculty members would I find here? How many disabled employees will I find here?

I know you have been interested in preparing students to deal with the disabled on the outside, and this is a definite growth field in the future. We are dealing with a new law called Public Law No. 94142, the Education of all Handicapped Children Act, and as part of that there are going to be many more jobs as classroom aides, in helping children with special needs to function in regular academic environments; recreation aides in opening recreation and community programs to students and adults with special needs so they can participate and really become part of this community. I think that is an effort you ought to support.

If I leave you with only one thought--the greatest change that has to take place in the future here and everywhere is the way we deal with disability ourselves. Better than me coming here is for you all to watch a movie on CBS on March 12th called "To Race the Wind." It is the story of Mainstream's founder, a blind lawyer who lives in Washington, and it's his autobiography. It talks about what it was like for him to get through Harvard College and Harvard Law School, what it was like for him to deal with attitudes of the academic community, the students who were told "don't help him, you'll make him dependent," the professor who didn't like the fact that his seeing-eye dog howled every time he read "Beowolf." After the student got out of Harvard College and Harvard Law School, he couldn't get a job. Forty-two law firms turned him down saying that there's no such thing as a blind lawyer. After awhile, he finally did get a job, but by that time he had found himself another option so he put the job off for a year and went to Oxford. He got sick while he was there and they put him in the hospital, sent him down for X-rays with an attendant. He got down to the X-ray room and the nurse in charge said to the attendant, "What is his name?" The attendant turned to him and said, "What is your name?" "My name is Harold Krents." "His name is Harold Krents." "Where was he born?" "Where were you born?" This went on for about 20 minutes and I hate to ruin the stereotype that handicapped people all have wonderful dispositions and are an inspiration to mankind, but Krents was sick--you'll have to excuse him if he let the cause down just this once, and he said, "Oh my gosh, I'm only two feet away from both of you--by now it must be very clear that I don't need an interpreter," and the attendant turned to the nurse and said, "He says he doesn't need an interpreter."

The best thing that could happen is for me never to have to come back here again to be an interpreter for you.

SPECIAL STUDENT POPULATIONS:

The Role of the Community Colleges in Meeting the Educational Needs of Returning Women

Jeanne Fisher-Thompson, Project Associate for the
Project on the Status and Education of Women

I'm especially happy to talk about returning women and community colleges because I think they have a lot to offer each other. I'll begin with a definition of what I mean by returning or re-entry women. Far from being a homogeneous group, returning women are those women who have interrupted their education at some point before or during college. The most common reasons for this interruption have been starting work, marriage, or child-rearing. By the time a woman is ready to return to school, she may be anywhere from 22 to 90 years old, although the largest concentration of ages seems to be between 25 and 55. Returning women may be single, married, divorced, or widowed. They may or may not have children. They may be members of minority groups, have high, middle, or low incomes, be handicapped, have prior college experience or not. In general, their backgrounds tend to be more diverse than any group of traditional 18 to 21-year-old undergraduates because they have accumulated more life experience and have had more time to branch out in their interests.

Returning women have different needs and different reasons for coming back to school. For most, it is an economic necessity. A college education has long been seen as a route to better paying jobs. In these inflationary times, more women are ready to go back to school--to pick up where they left off, in order to increase their paychecks in the long run. This is the case not only for single women, but also for women who head households and women in two-paycheck families. Other women are returning to school for the satisfaction of completing a degree or to enrich their lives in non-job-related areas; however, this is not so much the case now as it was in the 1960's. What all returning women share is that they are part of a national trend. The enrollment of women in colleges has been growing steadily, and this trend is expected to continue.

Since this conference has been focusing on the future, I want to mention a few predictions made by the Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education. They predict that by the year 2000, 52 percent of all undergraduate students will be women and 50 percent of all undergraduates will be aged 22 or older. Just this past fall, the number of women enrolled in colleges exceeded the number of men for the first time and already more than a third of today's college students are 25 or older. The Carnegie Council also predicts that by the year 2000 a projected 23 percent drop in enrollment of traditional students will be offset by increases in the nontraditional student population, including adult women. According to the Census Bureau, the number of women college students in the 25 to 34-year-old age bracket rose 187 percent between 1970 and 1978, compared to a 48 percent increase in the same age group for men. Also, between 1970 and 1978, the number of men over 25 enrolled at two-year schools doubled while the number of women over 25 enrolled at two-year schools tripled.

It seems clear from these and other statistics that community colleges have quite a stake in meeting the needs of returning women since they are going to be the largest growing segment of the student population for a time to come. Community colleges have been the first to reflect this trend--strong evidence that their role is a special one. If it were not for community colleges, many students, including returning women, would never have the opportunity to go to college at all.

Educational Needs of Returning Women

The community college is often the first place a woman will turn when she decides to go back to school. The geographic location is probably convenient and the transition from non-student to student status may seem less jarring when one can start in the "community environment." If the community college encourages the returning student initially, she will be more likely to complete a degree, go on to graduate school, and come back to take refresher courses or new subjects. The community college experience takes on the role of being the deciding factor between the continued pursuit of education and the decision to give up on the idea of school altogether. This is why it is especially important for the returning woman's contact with the community college to be a supportive one--an experience that strengthens her commitment to resume her education.

By intervening at this point in the returning woman's life, community colleges have the opportunity to witness an amazing transformation. Studies have shown that the lack of both confidence and self-esteem that many women feel is directly related to the length of time they have spent out of school and out of the job market. Although re-entry women may initially return to school with limited confidence about their ability and low self-esteem, within a short time after being in class their confidence shoots up. They take pride in their perseverance, and the guilt feelings that once accompanied doing something "just for their own benefit" starts to ebb away. One continuing education director has described this process as a rebirth, a new blossoming of the personality astonishing to behold. For many women, the re-entry process is a last ditch effort to make the grade and make something of their lives. They take this action seriously and want others to treat their decision to return to school seriously also, not as a leisure time hobby.

Educational Needs of Returning Women

Faculty, administrators, and staff need to realize that a little bit of encouragement, especially in the first two semesters of a re-entry woman's college career, goes a long way. But encouragement and sensitivity are not enough to fulfill all of the returning woman's educational needs. There must also be the recognition of obstacles that specifically hinder returning women and the formulation of plans to remove these barriers. One of the most glaring obstacles to re-entry women is the lack of child care on most campuses. The need for such facilities is magnified when schools which do have some kind of child care report that names on waiting lists number into the hundreds. I've heard of a few cases where whole families packed up and moved across the United States to be near a school with a good child care facility. Since many potential returning women students are mothers with small children, benefits in increased enrollment could be tremendous if child care were provided free or at a reasonable cost.

Another obstacle for returning women is the lack of financial resources. Re-entry women are often women who need to become economically self-sufficient almost overnight. Widowhood, divorce, and separation result in countless numbers of "displaced homemakers" who are left to find their own way financially, often without what they believe are marketable skills. Community colleges can go a long way toward getting these women back into the mainstream through career development courses; academic, personal and vocational counseling; and financial aid. Financial aid can be in the form of scholarships, basic grants, guaranteed loans, national direct student loans, and any emergency grants and loans which the school might provide. It is important that the application forms for aid take into account that the student may be older than traditional age and no longer need a parent's consent to take out a loan. Some schools still require a parent's signature on aid forms for any student under 25 years of age even if the student is selfsupporting or married and living away from home. Financial aid for part-time students is also a re-entry issue, since many returning women attend school less than full time. Colleges need to do more to provide aid for this growing population of part-time students.

Besides these readily visible barriers to returning women students, there are less obvious ones, such as transfer policies. Since the great majority of re-entry women have already completed the equivalent of one year of college they will be eager to transfer this old credit to their new school. This is not a simple matter in some cases, if colleges have limits on the age of credits to be accepted for transfer or vague policies on the number or kind of credits transferable. Practices such as these affect women disproportionally, since women are very likely to have moved to accommodate a husband's job opportunities and to be returning to a different school from the one they started years ago.

Not only are clearly written transfer policies needed, but also good academic counseling services. The majority of women returning to school, about 74 percent, change their major and need qualified counselors to advise them of the best way to use their time and already earned credits. Besides academic counseling, returning women desperately need good vocational counseling.

Sometimes this can be done in conjunction with a major department and a cooperative education program. Cooperative education internships, whether paid or unpaid, become extremely valuable when the student is later looking for a job. Cooperative education is an area where few returning women have ventured but these possibilities could be tremendous, especially if the community college has strong ties with the local business community. Personal or supportive counseling is an important part of the overall counseling package. Some colleges provide counseling to returning women through the counseling department, the continuing education department, an office for adult students, a women's center, or any combination of the above. The important thing is that returning women know supportive counseling is available and know where to get it. I'm not talking about intensive therapy, but most returning women would be helped immeasurably by supportive counseling when they first enter school either by professional counselors or by "peer counselors." It is important for the returning woman to realize that she is not alone in her decision to re-enter school at an older age; that she is not alone in her difficulties of time management; and that she is not alone in her change of self-perception. Most re-entry women would welcome the chance to meet other returning women, either on a structured or unstructured basis. Some schools provide women's centers, or workshops, or brown bag lunches, or orientation sessions specifically geared toward re-entry women. It doesn't have to take a lot of money to encourage supportive networking.

As long as I've mentioned women's centers, I just want to say something about Title IX which prohibits discrimination on the basis of sex in federally assisted education programs. All programs must also be open to men and most centers report that men use their services, although to a lesser extent.

Other factors that community colleges need to take into consideration are sensitizing the faculty to the needs of re-entry women and perhaps offering training sessions for administrators and staff to acquaint them with the needs of re-entry women. With this in mind, it is often possible to modify existing programs,such as orientation programs, to serve re-entry women rather than start new programs.

Educational Needs of Returning Women

Although the educational needs of re-entry women are much the same as traditional students, different means for furthering this education are sometimes more successful for them; for example, re-entry women and adult students in general are more likely to take advantage of independent study programs. The "University Without Walls" concept is one that has been used successfully on many campuses, especially in rural areas or in cases where students have difficulty in getting to campus. Along these same lines are television courses. The idea of granting experiential learning credit is also attractive to re-entry women. Not only does it give a head start in completing college credits, but it is also a tremendous confidence booster for women who may have felt that they have been wasting time all those years when they were not in school or not in paid employment.

Other programs that appeal especially to re-entry women are certificate programs; for example, a business certificate would be much better for a woman who is going to look for a job than to have "two years of business courses." It gives her a little more credibility. The same holds true for the A.A. degree. It's a psychological stepping stone to have this degree, rather than just to count the courses separately. Courses in remedial skills, especially in math and science, are important to increase the number of subject areas open to women, and encourage participation in nontraditional fields.

I want to say one thing about part-time study, and that is the scheduling problem. What good is it if returning women can go to class--in the evening but find the bookstore, library and administrative offices closed? This is a common problem that needs a flexible solution. It should also be noted that once they get into school, re-entry women are by and large model students. No one forces them to go to class--in most cases, they have made big sacrifices to get there. Often the logistics of arranging things so that an adult woman can go to class are staggering--carpools, babysitters, work schedules, shopping for the family--all these have to be juggled before many returning students can make it to class. It stands to reason that once they get there, they're going to make the minutes count. In fact, a recent study has shown that the grade point averages of re-entry women are not only higher than those of traditional 18 to 21-year-old students but also higher than their own GPAs when they started college earlier.

Returning women have maturity and a different perspective, and can contribute much to class discussions and to the college experience of younger students. It is clearly in the interest of community colleges to cultivate this older student population. It will take foresight, planning and a clear commitment on the part of community colleges to successfully meet the educational needs of returning women students, but it certainly will be worth the effort.

SPECIAL STUDENT POPULATIONS:

The Role of the Community College in Meeting the Educational Needs of Older Americans

Arthur S. Flemming, Chairman, U.S. Commission on Civil Rights and
Former Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare,
and Special Consultant to the President on Aging

As I have had the opportunity over a period of the last ten years of focusing a great deal of attention on the field of aging, it has been my privilege to travel throughout the country and participate in many meetings involving older persons. And, I have always insisted on the opportunity of responding to their questions and to their comments. A number of messages have come through to me--they're loud and clear and one of those messages has been, "We want to continue to be involved in life; we don't want to be put on the shelf." I think that attitude on the part of older persons is understandable. Non-involvement in life leads to rotten mental, physical and spiritual deterioration. In other words, older persons sense that it is important from the standpoint of their own lives to continue to be involved. Also, the other side of the coin is that our nation can ill-afford to pass by the opportunities that are presented for the unique services, the unique contributions that can be rendered by older persons. I feel that the opportunities for involvement in life on the part of older persons fall into three broad categories: paid employment, full-time or part-time; self-employment; and working as volunteers. If older persons are to take advantage of these opportunities, they need counseling assistance, additional training and opportunities for receiving service in the area of placement.

Of all the postsecondary institutions in our country, I feel that up to the present time the community college has been most responsive to the need that older persons have for assistance in the area of counseling, in the area of training, and in the area of placement if they are really going to have the opportunity for continued involvement in life.

It isn't possible to consider this issue of continued involvement in life without taking cognizance of the fact that certainly since the mid-1930s our country has followed a policy of sometimes encouraging and in other instances forcing people to retire at a particular age from their first careers. Personally, I have always felt that a policy that requires retirement at a given age is unsound, and I have always tried to do everything possible to bring about a change in those policies. I'm glad I've lived long enough to see some significant developments in this direction. As some of you know, the age discrimination and employment act was amended a little over a year ago by the Congress to eliminate compulsory retirement in the federal government completely and to raise the upper level as far as the age discrimination and employment act is concerned from 65 to 70 which means that employers, both public and private, cannot force retirement before 70. I recognize the fact that there are a couple of exemptions in there, including one that applies to higher education. As one who has been associated with the field of higher education over a considerable period of time, I'm rather ashamed of the fact that some leaders in the field of higher education asked for that exemption. I think the field of education should be in the forefront in trying to bring about a change in this policy rather than being forced into following a policy of this kind. I've always felt that policies that require retirement at a given age, irrespective of the merit of the case, are nothing more or less than a lazy person's device for dealing with what otherwise can prove to be a difficult personnel problem for one person or for a group of persons. But, even more fundamental than that, I have always felt that those policies were in direct conflict with the concept of the dignity and worth of each human being.

A little over a year ago I was asked by the leaders of a particular foundation to chair a committee on careers for older Americans. This committee of about twenty leaders from the field of labor, management, education, and also the public sector was asked to focus on the issue that I have just been talking about, and we were asked particularly with the help of staff to develop a report which would be of some assistance to people in the public and private sector. We did issue a report. The report is entitled, "Older Americans, an Untapped Resource, Why the Resource Must Be Tapped, How It Can Be Done." There are recommendations in the report addressed to both the public and private sector, but there are also some recommendations addressed to the field of education. I would just like to share those three recommendations with you. I make no effort to amplify the recommendation but just share the recommendation with you. I'll be frank about it and say that these are recommendations that I did put before the committee but the committee accepted them unanimously so that they do reflect my own personal convictions which I was able to sell to the members of the committee.

Recommendation No. 1. Educational and other cultural institutions help the nation to stop wasting its resource of older people by making it unmistakably clear that they are ready and willing to help people to meet their creative needs, including assisting them in continuing to work or to re-enter the work force on a paid, self-employed or volunteer basis.

Recommendation No. 2. Educational institutions at the secondary and post-secondary level reflect their commitment to the national objective of helping older people to achieve their highest potential by making positive efforts to contact and to challenge older people to participate in programs that will keep them in touch with society and will point up opportunities for their involvement in cultural, economic, and social activities by providing counseling services designed to match the skills and abilities of older people with opportunities for new careers by developing training programs that are directly related to opportunities for new careers as paid, self-employed, or volunteer workers and by providing placement services that will help to match up older people with job openings.

Recommendation No. 3. Those responsible for appropriating funds or making gifts and grants to educational and other cultural institutions recognize the unique role that continuing education must play if the nation is to be served effectively by its growing population of older people.

Let me amplify a couple of those recommendations by making positive efforts to contact and to challenge older people to participate in programs. All we're saying is that it is incumbent on the educational institution--and now I'm thinking particularly of the postsecondary and especially of the community college--to conduct an outreach program. Older people are not going to flock to campuses on their own initiative. It is going to be necessary to get out and recruit older persons for programs that are related to the possibility of their becoming involved in second or third careers. I do not quarrel at all with the efforts on the part of educational institutions, particularly postsecondary educational institutions, to offer what I refer to as enrichment courses for older persons, but I do take issue with those who say that those are the only kind of courses that older persons are interested in taking. I believe that if the postsecondary educational institutions overlook the fact that older persons are interested in preparing and participating in second or third careers, they are missing the point of what's happening as far as older persons in our population are concerned.

And then I can sum up the other recommendations by simply saying that when we work with younger persons in order to help them to get ready for their first careers, we accept the fact that they need and can profit by counseling, training and placement services. The older persons who are looking forward to second and third careers likewise can profit by and need counseling, training and placement services. I feel that there is a tremendous opportunity here and that if it is approached in that spirit that there will be a genuine response.

A favorite story coming out of the second White House Conference on Aging in 1971 is a story of George Black, a member of the black community who at the time was just about 90 years of age. He is still living which means of course that he's either reached 100 or a little bit beyond it. He lives in Winston-Salem, North Carolina. He's an expert in making brick by hand. Our government learned of his expertise and invited him to go to Guiana in Latin America to help teach others how to make brick by hand. When he came back, he said, "I've always prayed the Lord that my last days would be my best days." That prayer is the prayer of millions of older persons throughout our nation.

Community colleges and other postsecondary institutions have the opportunity of helping to answer those prayers by helping to make it possible for older persons to become involved in second or third careers, in paid employment, part-time or full-time, in self-employment, or in work as volunteers, and that third category is very important. That third category calls for counseling, training and placement just as much as the first or second category calls for it.

I've been fascinated by listening to my two colleagues on this panel. As a result of my everyday activities as Chairman of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, I just want to say "Amen" to what both of them have said, and I think you can see from what I've said that there's a linkage between what they have been saying and what I've been saying. I'm confident there's a linkage between what all three of us have been saying and what is being said in another panel dealing with opportunities for minorities. I believe that if the postsecondary educational institutions--right now I'll put particular emphasis on the community college--approach this as positively, aggressively, creatively, and imaginatively as they do getting people ready for first careers that there will be a tremendous response. Furthermore, you'll get satisfaction out of knowing that you have helped older persons achieve their higher potential as older persons.

SPECIAL STUDENT POPULATIONS:

Minority Students in Higher Education

Lorenzo Morris, Senior Fellow, Institute of Study of
Educational Policies, Howard University

For the future as well as the present, Montgomery College is probably in a lot better position than most two-year institutions. The stereotypic community college is one that is less than 30 years old, is located in an urban center and is publicly funded. I, at least, know that the latter is true for Montgomery College. The faculty and administration in the typical community college is like that of most four-year institutions and universities--that is, it is 95% white and mostly male. Unlike most four-year institutions, however, most community faculty have master's degrees and not Ph.D.'s and have very little research orientation. There are few professional association involvements among the faculty in the two-year institution and presumably most of the interest of the faculty would be, at least as far as higher education is concerned, in the institution itself.

The subject that I was asked to talk about is minorities in two-year colleges in the future. That turns out as a very interesting subject for this college because of its relatively low minority student enrollment. Typically, the students in the stereotypically two-year college are mostly white (even though they have high minority enrollments) and strangely enough, mostly female by a small margin of 51 to 52%. They have a higher minority enrollment than four-year colleges and universities, about close to 20% as opposed to less than 16%. It's close to 20 for minorities and maybe 9 or 10% for black students at two-year colleges--that is, 9 to 10% of the students enrolled are black. Most of the students--as many as 90% in the typical two-year college--are interested in transferring to a four-year college. Of course, a large proportion of them, 10% or more, are enrolled in vocational programs. This last issue brings us to the problem that students at two-year institutions currently experience or have experienced in the past. Most of the minorities, a vast majority enrolled in your institutions, expect to go to a four-year college. At the same time, even a greater majority of them will never get to a four-year college. The chances are less than 1 in 5 that a minority student entering a two-year college will leave with an associate degree, though the vast majority of them expect to get it. There are similar tuition rates for non-minority and white students entering two-year colleges; however, the problem extends to what's called "articulation" or the success of minorities in achieving their transfer goals.

I think that the history of the two-year college movement is interesting if you want to understand the future--that is the development of two-year colleges. While over 50% of all black students in higher education, for example, are enrolled in two-year colleges, these colleges were obviously not designed to serve minorities in particular. Nevertheless, they developed during a period in which minority enrollment in higher education increased dramatically. As a consequence, the earlier recommendations of groups like the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education that the two-year colleges be expanded were reinterpreted to mean that the expansion of two-year institutions should serve the needs of non-traditional students and minorities in particular.

I think that to one unfamiliar with higher education, the decision to expand two-year institutions as a partial solution to problems of equality of opportunity in higher education might look a bit curious. That's because the logic behind the decision has faded from view. Specifically, there was a belief that four-year colleges and universities could not handle the influx of students necessary to equalize opportunity for minorities and that they could not handle them without a major devaluation of the academic structure of education. Secondly, non-traditional students and minorities were not prepared to enroll at the level that most traditional colleges were inclined to expect. So, in general, the expectation that blacks and other minorities would benefit from enrollment in two-year colleges rested not so much on the unique characteristics of these two-year institutions in terms of the program structure but in terms of their presumed adaptability.

The needs of the two-year college freshman in 1977-1978 when these data were collected were greater than the needs of freshmen in other public institutions in terms of family income, assuming constant cost. The median family income of freshmen in two-year colleges in 1972 was about $11,000 a year as against $15,000 a year for a university freshman. This family income difference across institutions persisted through 1976 and 1977. By 1976, two-year college students had mean family incomes of $14,475 a year as compared to $20,000 a year for a university freshman. Between 1972 and 1976, four-year college freshmen were in what is called the middle income category while two-year college freshmen were in the lower income category. I think the future of two-year colleges is heavily impacted by financial considerations.

Generally, higher education is faced with declining enrollment, and I suppose one of the reasons for calling a conference like this is to look at what the future declining enrollments may hold for higher education. Many institutions are expected to fall by the wayside. I happened to be at two recent meetings of the National Institute for Education in which researchers were called together to make projections about what research can do to investigate this dismal future of higher education. One of the most widely accepted suggestions was that we look into how institutions die.

The Carnegie Council in its recent study said two-year institutions are the least threatened of colleges and universities. They're the least threatened because of their special service to non-traditional students. The expected participation of minorities, blacks and hispanics in higher education is expected to grow at least through 1995 in terms of the proportion participating. So institutions capable of enrolling these students are those that are most likely to be able to weather the storm of declining enrollments.

The attraction of international students may also be a factor in preserving some institutions, generally not two-year institutions; however, I understand that Montgomery College might be among those that would benefit. And, it's noteworthy that the recent federal budget was increased by 50% to $30 million for international education in the Department of Education, so that there is an expectation that international students will serve a role. However, there are other alternate considerations that I would like to bring to your attention. If you look at the headcount of two-year institutions, you come to another area in which the future can be affected by federal action. The total enrollment of two-year colleges is about 3,300,000 plus; however, what's called (FTE) full-time equivalent enrollment) is about 2,000,000 plus. Many federal and state funds for higher education are divided among institutions on the basis of FTE (full-time equivalent). The highest percentage of students enrolled part time is in two-year institutions so that the number of students is much larger than the full-time equivalent, but the money is provided on a full-time equivalent basis. It gives results like the following: the increased enrollment from 1976-77 to the next year in two-year colleges was 2.7% in numbers of students, but it was only .6% increase in FTE. If you want to figure out the difference, it's a difference of 400% in the increase. So it's a trivial consideration to some extent but it's not trivial in terms of the money that is associated with it. So, some of the future of two-year institutions will depend on their looking at the ways governments fund higher education in trying to get a better share of the funds. This issue is further exemplified by the recent enrollment data. Full-time enrollment in two-year colleges declined by almost 2% from 1976-77 to 1977-78 but part-time enrollment actually increased by 6%.

The characteristics of minority students associated with the enrollment increases are significant because minority students were part of the increase as a rule. They were also as likely as not to be part-time, more likely to be non-residential and therefore to be going to a community college. The problem with the future in attracting minority students is that surveys of their preferences show that two-year colleges may have to make some adjustments to attract them; that is, minority students would prefer to be residential, prefer to be full-time students, and actually prefer to be in four-year institutions. Those things can be overcome if we look at some of the alternatives.

I think the future of two-year colleges, to take the Carnegie Council's point of view, depends on several things. These institutions have several strengths that have to be carefully managed. One is their diversity in terms of projections of enrollment change. Diversity will be a major factor for protecting against declining enrollments. Location and career development are major factors where economic considerations will be paramount as they are expected to be for the next decade or more. Along with that, cost and non-residential factors as they pertain to students will have an impact. And, finally going back to the origin of these colleges, flexibility of forms of attendance allowing for part-time enrollment will be important. However, this means that part-time enrollment should be adequately supported by public funds.

A lot of economic crunches will mean that four-year colleges and universities increasingly are beginning to compete for the same set of students over which two-year colleges have had a command. Given that these students often expect a four-year college program, they have to be approached in a way that shows them they can benefit from attendance at a two-year college in terms of their long-range goals. Required will be coordination with four-year colleges for academic programs and transfer programs.

A historical advantage of two-year colleges is open admissions and ease of access. That may turn to be a competitive disadvantage to a mild extent inasmuch as prestige may be an important factor in the survival of institutions in a period of declining enrollment. Probably the biggest deficit is the general prestige of higher education. The American public has not become more conservative about education but has become more negative about it. Such attitudes will impact directly on funds and resources; for example, since Proposition 13 was passed in California, enrollment in two-year colleges has declined by 10% and that's a very short time ago.

I think there are a number of strategies to overcome these problems. One is articulation. A major problem is that students expect to get a four-year degree, but don't. A major aspect of that problem is that they were not correctly counseled in the first place. Maybe they would have been better off in a career program. The data shows that there's no clear counseling that corresponds to what the student expects to obtain from a college education. In particular, many students, especially minority students, do not know that they are not enrolled in a transfer program when they are not, or they do not know that they are not being prepared in high school for a college curriculum. These things can be helped by careful articulation and development of careful relationships between all sorts of institutions. Along with that, some lobbying at federal and state levels to correct certain considerations might be important. For example, the Higher Education Act contains an unfunded title called, "Title 10 for Two-Year Institutions." The association representing two-year institutions chose to fight over smaller sums distributed in other Titles for all colleges than to demand or insist on the reauthorization or the funding of Title 10 which would have served two-year institutions.

Finally, I think two-year colleges will look very much in 1990 as the stereotype looks now, except that they probably will have much more carefully developed articulation programs with other institutions and better student services and counseling to assure that students know what they are getting.

SPECIAL STUDENT POPULATIONS:

Community Colleges and the Minority Students: Past Progress and Future Directions

Dr. James Tschechtelin, Director of Planning and Research,
Maryland State Board for Community Colleges

By way of quick background, let's go back to 1968, a turbulent year in terms of race, students, and citizens of the United States. We had some urban disorders in 1968, leading to the formation of The National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders. The Commission ended up with a thick book that surprised some of the people in the establishment by saying that much of the disorder was rooted in racism, a persistent pattern of problems in housing, education and jobs that seems to repeat itself, causing a completely depressing situation. In Maryland, that kind of concern took the form of some pressure from HEW, and in 1974, the Maryland Plan for Completing the Desegration of Public, Post-Secondary Education Institutions was published. Actual figures in that book were from 1972, and they talked at that time only about full-time students. The total number of full-time students in Maryland community colleges in 1972 was 23,301, and the number of blacks who were full-time students was 2,660, or about 11%. The goal in 1974 was that we would have 32,000 full-time students by 1980 and that 5,562 would be black, about 17%. We didn't quite have the growth in full-time enrollment that was projected. We had 28,106 last fall and 6,483 were black students, for a percentage of about 23%. On a percentage basis, the numbers look good for community colleges and they look good for four-year institutions, if you don't take into consideration where the students attend. The following data is from the report "Black and White Students in Maryland Community Colleges." First of all, as far as the differences in the demographic characteristics, black and white students are very different. Blacks attend more on a full-time basis. This may have something to do with the way financial aid is awarded, because more financial aid is available to full-time students. Black students and white students are in transfer programs in about equal percentages. Among those in occupational programs, more blacks are inclined to be in business. Blacks tend to carry more credit but we also find that after 3-1/2 years, fewer credits are completed--27 credits on the average completed within 3-1/2 years for blacks versus 33 credits for whites.

Next we looked at our student follow-up studies. We followed up students 3-1/2 years after entry. We found that black students have a higher interest in achieving a degree or certificate than whites, with 64% of blacks saying that their goal was an AA degree versus 58% for whites. Whites are more interested in courses of interest, the personal enrichment type of goal. As far as their personal goal for attending, we found some considerable differences, with black students being more occupationally oriented and white students being somewhat more interested in transfer as a reason for being at the college. We studied degree goal achievement, employment goal achievement, and transfer goal achievement. For example, among those students who said they wanted to get a job upon completion of their work at a community college, how many were in fact employed full-time? Among whites who said they came to the college to get an AA degree, 37% had done that by the time they had left the college. Among blacks, it was 23%, a considerably lower amount. In terms of employment achievement, there was no significant difference by race. Among blacks who wanted to transfer, 53% eventually did transfer versus 71% for whites. The good news is that since the report was written, we do have some evidence that among graduates there are no significant differences by race on transfer goal achievement. That has important implications that if the support services and the financial aid can be strong enough to help people persist to a degree, then we don't find racial differences in transfer goal achievement.

The primary difference between the races as far as reasons for leaving college is a lack of sufficient financial aid; six percent of blacks said that lack of aid was their reason for leaving and only 1% of whites. Looking into the future in terms of community colleges, I don't see a very plus decade in terms of assistance to minority students. There are some pluses and some minuses, and one plus is the low tuition cost. Another is convenient college location, so that people can be employed or be at home and still attend. The fact that we're going into more adult education would be a plus. Also, a lot of these adult education courses seem to be job related. That will be a plus. I don't know what to think about remedial education. I was at another community college where some faculty members were talking about their tremendous frustration with students who couldn't read or write, or couldn't read or write to the extent that faculty thought they should be able. Their frustration was very real, and people were not debating it. One of the things that wasn't mentioned in the room had to do with race. Race was never mentioned, but it seemed to me that it was one of the issues. Students were coming to the college less prepared than students they formerly taught, and this group of faculty just didn't know exactly how to deal with it. How will we prepare ourselves with this differential fertility rate that we've heard a lot about? If the mixture of students changes in the 1980s and there are more black students, more minority students, that may change the mixture of our colleges in relation to how much remedial education and how well the college is prepared to do that.

You've been reading in the newspapers about access in higher education. What is the University of Maryland going to do in tightening up entrance requirements? What will the state colleges do? Right now, state colleges are for all intents and purposes, open door. Will they remain open door, and if they do not, what effect will that have on community colleges? That's a critical question, and it's not clear how that is going to end up. As far as affirmative action is concerned, I have to put a minus by that. I think there's an ebb and flow in the culture where certain things become fads at one time and then fade out. I think affirmative action has been reduced mostly to record keeping. Bureaucrats love to keep records, and that's mostly what's happening now.

It has been written, "What happens to a dream deferred? Does it dry up like a raisin in the sun or does it explode?" In the late 1960s we had some explosions. I hope that in the 1980s we don't have dreams drying up. Let's help community colleges to insure that those dreams don't dry up.

SPECIAL STUDENT POPULATIONS:

The International Student: Enrollment Trends and Educational Needs

Valerie Woolston, Director of International Education Services,
University of Maryland, College Park

I'm really going to be talking about foreign international students, not immigrants and refugees.

When I started to do some enrollment research to prepare my remarks, I looked into the only statistical source of data on foreign students in the United States only to discover that the Rockville Campus of Montgomery College has the second largest foreign student enrollment among community colleges in the United States. At least it did in 1977. Since most of the projections which are done with regard to foreign student enrollment are simply crystal balling, I really felt that you here at Montgomery College probably know much more about the whole question of foreign student enrollment than I do; however, since I've been asked to discuss this subject, I will be glad to lead off and hope you will carefully question any conclusions I may draw and add to any information that I might lack.

When asked to look at the future, I did the same thing that any of us would do and that was to look at comparative figures for the past. I discovered that in 1967 there were very very few foreign students attending community colleges in the United States. By 1976-77 there were 31,000 foreign students enrolled in community colleges and by 1978 there were 37,000, representing 15% of all the foreign students in the United States. In that year, Montgomery College was ranked 33rd among all U. S. institutions with 1,000 or more foreign students, not just community colleges but all institutions in the United States. I haven't seen any more recent statistics. I'm sure the enrollment of foreign students in junior and community colleges has continued to grow as has the general population of foreign students in the United States. In 1977, there were 203,000 foreign students in the United States and in 1978 there were 235,000. The latest figure for this year that I've heard, and that means it may be a rumor, is that there are now 285,000 foreign students in the United States.

What does all this mean? Will foreign student enrollment continue to grow in the United States and in junior and community colleges? I believe it will. First of all, we have gloomy predictions of declining enrollments among our own U. S. college populations. Foreign students could, therefore, provide full-time bodies for our lagging FTE in some institutions and in the opinion of some, education is one of the United States' most valuable export products. In fact, foreign countries, especially government and other sponsors in the developing countries interested in educating the modern labor force, see American education in precisely this way. Perhaps many of you are aware of the Nigerian government's efforts to do mid-level manpower training in the United States. Over the past two years they have placed more than 6,000 students in community college vocational programs. The government was interested in short-term training programs which could produce practitioners, and the U. S. was chosen, along with France and Germany, as the country best able to provide the necessary program. Naturally, such programs have specific expectation of the students and of the sponsors. These expectations frequently need to be elaborated, for what the consumer sponsor has in mind may not coincide with normal program offerings.

Secondly, the need for foreign students to study abroad is still a growing need in many developing countries. We hear that many countries only want students to come to graduate study in the U. S. It is understandable that their governments may want more mature, culturally, stable students to study overseas, so the likelihood of the brain drain is lessened. The demographics of elitist narrow educational systems often mean that very bright, very talented students are unable to continue to study at home simply because there are not enough places available at the next level of study; therefore, individual students will continue to seek opportunities to study abroad.

Third, the inflation rate in other parts of the world that have their currencies closely tied to the dollar have an even less favorable rate of exchange in other parts of the world than we do. What that means in real language is that while Latin Americans ~~have~~ often studied in Europe in the past, the number of Latin Americans seeking study opportunities in the United States is steadily increasing. Latin American institutions in particular are especially interested in reciprocal exchange. In other words, while it is getting more and more expensive to study in other parts of the world, it is getting comparatively cheaper, hard as that may be for us to believe, for foreign students to study here. For this reason, we may also see an increase in students from developed countries coming here, for instance, Germany and Great Britain.

Fourth, countries overseas are beginning to impose heavy tuition fees. This is especially true in Great Britain, where tuition cost for foreign students will range from $3,500 to $11,000 beginning this fall. This means that many students from the Commonwealth who might have formerly studied in Great Britain will now be looking for other places to study. All these are indicators of continual growth of the foreign student population in the United States.

Does this apply to junior and community colleges? I believe it does, and I think the proportion of foreign students in junior and community colleges will increase.

SEP 18 1981

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
ERIC CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGES
96 POWELL LIBRARY BUILDING
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90024